

THE OFFENDER IN THE COMMUNITY

YEARBOOK

NATIONAL PROBATION ASSOCIATION
NINETEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-EIGHT

CURRENT OPINION ON THE TREATMENT AND PREVENTION
OF DELINQUENCY AND CRIME. PAPERS GIVEN AT THE
THIRTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION
AT SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, JUNE 24-29, 1938

Edited by
MARJORIE BELL

THE NATIONAL PROBATION ASSOCIATION
50 WEST FIFTIETH STREET • NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

1894

1894

1894

1894

1894

1894

1894

1894





FOREWORD

THIS issue of the Yearbook of the National Probation Association is a symposium of current thought concerning probation, the juvenile court, parole, and crime prevention. Its articles deal with recent progressive developments in these fields and voice some of the newer philosophies. It will be noted that there is repeated emphasis on better understanding of the delinquent himself and on the enlistment of all community agencies for effective case or group treatment. To bring about these desirable ends stress is laid on securing better trained and better qualified workers. Progress in these directions and in more adequate organization of the work is reported for many states.

This volume contains the papers presented at the thirty-second annual conference of the Association held in Seattle, Washington, June 24 to 29, 1938. One paper was an address given at the National Conference of Social Work. Papers presented at the third annual conference on coordinating councils are included, also reports on the work of the Association.

It is hoped that this volume may be of practical help to workers in the field of delinquency and its prevention, and that it may add to public understanding of these grave social problems and stimulate support for progressive measures looking toward their solution.

CHARLES L. CHUTE

December 1938



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I THE SOCIAL VIEWPOINT IN CRIME CONTROL

	Page
Sanford Bates Next Steps in Crime Control.....	1
Joseph N. Ulman A National Program to Develop Pro- bation and Parole.....	27
Charles L. Chute Ideals and Realities in the Probation Field	43
George W. Smyth The Family in Court.....	53

II TRAINING FOR WORK WITH DELINQUENTS

Philip A. Parsons Qualifying Workers for the Correc- tional Field	66
Victor C. Passage Preparing for Probation Work.....	87
Joseph P. Murphy Training For and On the Job.....	93

III PSYCHIATRIC SERVICE

Samuel W. Hartwell Understanding One Another.....	109
Allan East The Traveling Clinic	127
O. H. Close The Use of Psychiatry in Correctional Schools	133

IV PROBATION AND PAROLE IN RURAL AREAS

Mabel E. Wilkes Rural Probation Work	140
B. H. Robinson Probation on the Frontier.....	150
Robert C. Edson Statewide Coverage in Probation and Parole	160
Vera H. McCord Limitations of Rural Case Work for Delinquent Children	167

V THE YOUNG DELINQUENT

Jacob M. Braude The 'Why' of Bad Boys.....	180
Richard A. Chappell The Child in the Federal Court.....	204

VI BOARDING HOMES FOR DELINQUENT CHILDREN

Donald E. Long	Boarding Home Care for the Delinquent Child	211
C. M. Schermerhorn	Delinquent Boys in Foster Homes.....	225

VII THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE GROUP

Kenneth I. Wollan	The Use of Group Activity in Probation Work	240
Glen O. Grant	Recreation as Crime Prevention.....	256

VIII TEAMWORK FOR DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

Elisabeth Lossing	Police Protective Work.....	273
Lowell Juilliard Carr	A State Crime Prevention Program....	289
Harry A. Wann	Community Coordination, Its Philosophy, Principles and Trends.....	296
Kenneth S. Beam	Coordinating Council Progress, 1938..	308

IX LEGAL DIGEST

Gilbert Cosulich	Legislation and Decisions Affecting Probation and Juvenile Courts, 1938	327
Joseph P. Murphy	Interstate Compacts for Probation and Parole	335
Helen G. MacGill	Canadian Juvenile Court Laws.....	343

X THE NATIONAL PROBATION ASSOCIATION

Charles L. Chute	Review of the Year 1937-1938.....	349
Treasurer's Report	366
Minutes of the Annual Meeting.....		369
Officers, Board of Trustees, Advisory Committee, Professional Council, Staff		373
Report of the Professional Council.....		379
Minutes, Meeting of the Professional Council.....		382
By-laws of the Association.....		385
Program of the Association		389
INDEX		391

I THE SOCIAL VIEWPOINT IN CRIME CONTROL



Next Steps in Crime Control

SANFORD BATES¹

Executive Director, Boys' Clubs of America, Inc.

THERE are occasions when as we look back through the long and bitter history of social treatment of the law-breaker we seem to have made significant progress. There are other times when satisfactory answers to some of these questions seem impossible. Encouraging evidence is the fact that the National Conference of Social Work is giving a place in its regular program to the consideration of the prison as a social problem.

The striking advance in the means and methods of public communication has recently placed a new burden upon the prison which it never before felt called upon to assume, namely the interpretation of its aims and purposes to an audience constantly widening in numbers and interest. Time was when a prison warden could say that what went on behind the prison wall was nobody's business but his own. Periodicals, the pulp magazines, the radio and the movie have brought and are bringing constantly before us all, whether we like it or not, a vivid and none too accurate portrayal of events and happenings in these places of punishment, and we can no longer avert our consideration from them.

Consistent with the general tendency of our country to advertise and to propagandize, these organs of public communication have not refrained from the temptation

1. Paper given at the National Conference of Social Work, 1938.

to dramatize the plight of the criminal and our efforts to reform him. I doubt if there is any branch of the public service which has suffered more from misunderstanding and the dissemination of misinformation than our penal system, suffering as much from exaggeration as from understatement and lack of interpretation.

Our people, dismayed at the failure to bring the volume of crime within what we consider to be safe proportions, smarting under the criticism that we support many times the number of criminals in America that are tolerated in the counties of western Europe, have piled reprobation upon the prison and the parole systems of the country, and it is becoming difficult to approach a consideration of the prison question with a truly open mind. Nationally we are receptive to striking figures; therefore prophets of disaster tell us that crime costs \$15,000,000,000 a year and we accept it without any very clear idea of what this figure really amounts to, and without having seen any itemization of it because there can be none. We hear someone say that the age of criminals is decreasing, and we believe it without attempting to get at the truth, which is that the age of criminals is higher than it was fifteen years ago, and averages higher than our total population. We unconsciously fall in with the general tendency to classify together all people who have been found guilty of a crime without any clear realization of the fact that there are as many types of criminals, almost, as there are types of people.

Occasionally opprobrious and ridiculous epithets are hurled at those who express the opinion that there is more to this question of crime and its control than punishing the caught criminal. There has been an assumption that if you demand a scientific and thoroughgoing system of public protection, a system which includes the difficult task of knowing something about the prisoner, of attempting

to reduce the number of criminals by improving their characters or at least not making them worse, a system that will afford the public the extra protection of parole supervision after release from prison, then you are lacking in courage and run the risk of being referred to as a "sob sister" or a "softie." Well, perhaps there are people who sob over the criminals and send them flowers, but I happen to have encountered very few of them. We all have no disposition to withhold our gratitude and admiration for federal and state law-enforcement officers who meet danger courageously. But after all, it seems to me that it takes some courage to manage and control the ordinary penal institution day after day, night after night, week after week, year after year, never coming up for a breath of air. And I am inclined to believe that if we are to eliminate sentiment from the prison problem, we ought to eliminate it in both directions, and that a man who demands the maximum of punishment for every criminal, who thus removes every incentive to rehabilitation, who can see no hope of reformation in any of them, is just as much controlled by fear and is as emotional as the other kind of "sob sister."

In the subject of penology, no less than in any other branch of the social sciences, we can find no substitute for truth, nor can we fail to face facts. We cannot solve the long standing and the perplexing problems of crime by strong language or prejudice or ignorance.

The Penologist's Viewpoint

The progressive penologist today does not believe in coddling criminals. He hates crime as much as anybody else. He believes, at least as to normal persons, in the potent power of penalties and rewards. He hopes to assist in the protection of the public. He does not think it is good protection to make big criminals out of little ones

either in prison or out, nor does his experience teach him that every man over whom a sentence has been pronounced is beyond the power of redemption. So far as deterrence goes he believes the greatest deterrent of crime would be provided by a more efficient and intelligent police force. Celerity of justice is more efficacious than severity. He points to the fact that only one out of six crimes known to be committed in the country has been cleared up by arrest. He believes in prompter and fairer trials. He sees no reason why even so important a case as the Sacco-Vanzetti trial should have taken seven years. He believes that the lawyers who represent the public should be as well trained, as competent and as honest as those the criminal can hire. He believes that judges who pass judgment upon human beings should know more of human nature than the law can teach them.

With reference to his own job, he believes that the prime purpose of a prison is not to make life comfortable for the convict but to assist in a long time program for greater public protection. He believes men go to prison as punishment and not for punishment. He for one is not quite sure who the true criminal is. It confuses him a little when he realizes that a few years ago it was a crime to have liquor in one's possession and not a crime to have gold, while now it is a crime to have gold in one's possession and not a crime to have liquor. He realizes that even within the confines of the United States the same crime is regarded differently in different places. Sometimes, unfortunately, he has to contemplate judgment being passed upon the culprit by men not much better than the culprit himself. Occasionally a parole board must wonder to itself why the blame is being heaped upon it when a jury in Brooklyn will acquit a self-confessed boy murderer, and so he comes to the conclusion that the whole business is not quite so simple as it sounds.

Have we not been too ready to accept the prison as a complete solution, as an inevitable recourse, and to expect the penal institution to perform miracles quite beyond its power to perform? Did you ever stop to wonder how the custom of locking a man up in a cage or behind a wall for long periods of time came to be adopted as a species of social discipline? Originally, of course, no one ever expected the prison to do a job of reformation. It was a place where torture was to be inflicted, or else the unfortunate wretch was there to be held until some other disposition was made of him. When the conscience of the community was aroused against the wholesale execution or deportation of criminals, there was not much left to do with the culprits but to leave them in the jails where they were being held. But it did not take long for a few clear thinking people to point out that a new problem immediately reared its head when this method was adopted.

Quite recently the Attorney General of the United States, over a nationwide radio hookup, explained in four words the justification for a new kind of prison treatment—"They all come out." And so we cannot separate the prison problem from the social problem in which it is enmeshed.

Whatever may be said about the Soviet system of handling prisoners, and however impossible, due to our democratic structure of government, it would be to duplicate any such system in this country, it does have one outstanding advantage. Life in the prison colony is so nearly normal that the prisoner slips into it without the necessity for adjustment and quite often stays indefinitely, and the government is spared the almost impossible task of reestablishing a man who has been stigmatized, enfeebled and handicapped by a long period in the abnormal and deteriorating atmosphere of a prison. It is hard for any program of rehabilitation to overcome this.

When I hear people say the prisons of America have failed, I sometimes wonder just what they mean. Failed at what? Surely they have not failed to make the inmates conscious of the fact that they have been removed from society. Prisons are still places of deprivation and suffering. The loss of liberty is the inevitable consequence of crime. Even at our best "country club" penitentiaries there is no waiting list of candidates and there is still a very general desire for parole. Perhaps these grim bastilles have failed to make men better by the process, but since when were prisons designed, equipped, or staffed for such a purpose? If all our prisons had to do was to make the inmates miserable, success would be almost assured. If they are to undertake the rather inconsistent task of making them better at the same time, that is quite another thing.

Progress

Some prisons are honestly trying to do this. Whether they can succeed at all depends, in my judgment, largely upon the degree to which the public can be made to understand and support the effort. In the attempt to do just this thing, in recent years some distinctly forward steps in prison management have been undertaken. Realizing the impossibility of re-inspiring a man while he was forced to live in a stone and steel cubicle three and one-half feet wide and seven feet high, among thousands of others hidden from view behind a forty-foot wall and guarded by machine guns, some new ventures in prison architecture have been undertaken and prison buildings more consistent with the attempt to reform have been erected. Men can be punished en masse and possibly scared into submission or deterred from recidivism, but when undertaking to refit them for life in the community, one must know something about the individual's qualifications, limita-

tions, and possibilities. Thus there has been undertaken in a few of our progressive states and the Federal Government a classification system which attempts to bring to bear upon each prisoner in accordance with his individual needs the entire resources of the institution. In some instances practical psychiatry has been called in as an aid to penology with interesting developments in the analysis of personality needs, in matters of discipline and for therapeutic experimentation. Some wardens are welcoming the assistance of medicine and the social sciences as they would appeal to experts in more practical lines. Removal of physical handicaps is often the first step towards reformation.

Again the Federal Prison Bureau has enlisted the services of half a hundred young college men with social work training under the common sense designation of warden's assistants. While every employee of a prison should be in a sense a social worker, those specially trained, as are these young men, find unique opportunities for service to more helpful inmates. They gather case histories; they foster and maintain family relationships and favorable outside contacts; they advise on purely social problems (not reached by doctor, chaplain or psychiatrist); they prepare both the inmate and his environment against the day of his release; they interpret the prisoner's problem to the case worker who will aid in his reestablishment.

The interesting experiment of specially trained chaplains in the federal prison service has likewise distinct possibilities.

One cannot consider the splendid prison education systems that have been adopted in New York and to a lesser extent in California, without feeling that here is a sincere and conscious effort to really protect the public against the ex-prisoner. Remarkable successes have been experi-

enced in several states in the establishment of prison farms and honor camps. The experience of the Federal Government is really astonishing in this connection. During a period of three years, over 9000 prisoners were transferred to open honor camps. Two hundred were reported missing, 189 were returned, making a net loss of 11 out of 9000 over a period of three years.

One must record two instances where prison work of the country seems to have had a setback during the last decade. Due to federal and state legislation it seems to be becoming increasingly difficult to provide constructive labor for prisoners. The Federal Government has made some attempt to minimize this evil through the late Prison Industries Reorganization Administration whose services have been recently dispensed with by the Congress. It is not easy to see how a prisoner can be returned to active life after five, ten or fifteen years spent in stultifying idleness.

Again, in spite of some forward-looking attempts in New York, New Jersey and the Federal Government to provide a dignified calling for prison workers, there has been little headway made toward the adoption of civil service methods in penal institutions. That such a policy is indispensable in the carrying out of the main objectives of prison management cannot be controverted. The Federal Bureau of Prisons has made the classified civil service applicable to every position in the Bureau and its field units, and through the adoption of in-service training courses, promotional examinations, and a regulation preventing the appointment of higher officials from the outside, has established a genuine career service. And the present leadership of the Federal Prison Bureau under James V. Bennett, a highly intelligent and conscientious public servant, is a guarantee that it will continue so.

But these bright spots are more or less dimmed by the

recent record of many states in permitting the infiltration of party politics in their penal systems. One does not like to get too oratorical about such a matter-of-fact subject, but until the hydra-headed monster of politics can be eliminated from our prisons, not to mention our impossible county jails, we may as well give up the attempt to make them agencies of public protection.

But there has been enough experience in America to establish the fact that a sufficient amount of punishment can be imposed and that headway can be made in the ultimate objective of prison protection. Residence in a prison does offer unique opportunities for prophylaxis, disciplinary training, education, inculcation of work habits, regularity of living, acquaintance, perhaps, with some of the great literature of all time, and an opportunity to mould one's conduct after men with high and sincere motives. If such an experiment can be accomplished by some effort at group education or self-government, it is still possible to make of our prisons and reformatories a regenerating influence.

It may be that we shall have to stifle some of our pet prejudices to do this. We shall have to agree to give prisoners some opportunity to work, both before and after they come out. We shall be obliged to recognize the fact that long prison terms have a queer effect upon some men's emotions. We shall have to risk the imputation of coddling prisoners at least enough to provide an environment that elevates rather than degrades.

Probation and Parole

I am confident that with many of the men whom we now feel it necessary to send to prison certain alternative disciplines will present themselves. We have never had the courage to apply the probation system to its fullest

extent. If our courts keep on crowding the prisons to suffocation, in self defense we may have to find some more effective, economical and prompt methods of penal discipline. We may even go so far as to say that if a man wrongs society he should be given an opportunity to repay that debt in a way that benefits society rather than entails extra expenses upon it.

But always the acid test of a prison and its effectiveness to protect the public will be—how do its graduates behave when they come out? England, fearing the results to the community of discharging prisoners from a term of penal servitude, wisely provided an intermediate period known as preventive detention. There is some rather bitter significance in this notion. If we had the kind of prison discipline we have been advocating we should not be so apprehensive.

The progressive penal administrator tries to meet this emergency through the device known as parole, but he is having an extremely hard time to convince the public of the wisdom of it. So insistent has been the propaganda against the whole subject of parole recently that scarcely a man or woman in the country has not been led to believe that here is the great and crowning evil of our penal system. If we could only, he thinks, prevent these nefarious parole boards from letting men out of prison, all might be well. He does not stop to consider that at most this would mean only a postponement and an ultimate intensification of the whole difficulty.

Now I would be the last to contend that parole systems have been effectively and wisely administered in many places, but I think I am prepared to prove that of all the devices of our law-enforcement system none of them has been more unfairly or more unjustifiably accused than has parole as a system. Parole is not pardon. It does not on the average shorten the prisoner's sentence. As a matter

of fact, it lengthens it. It does not relieve the prisoner from his responsibilities. It adds to them. It is an extension of that protection from the criminal to which the public is entitled. It is the logical sequence of every prison term. It helps the prisoner adjust himself in society. It makes it possible to secure work and living quarters for the discharged prisoner and to release him at a propitious time. It makes possible his prompt recall to the institution even though what he has done may not be definitely proved as an offense. It assists him to walk the straight and narrow path of reformation and enables officers of the government to keep a watchful eye upon him. I have many times quoted figures to show that in spite of inadequate and inefficient administration in many places a remarkably high percentage of ex-convicts succeed in working out their parole terms successfully. And from such figures as we have as to the *total new volume* of crime, less than one per cent of the current arrests are found to be on parole.

There is no dissent from the proposition that the dangerous criminal should be kept in prison or at least should be kept somewhere away from society just as long as is necessary to insure adequate protection. This degree of protection might be attained through the establishment of penal colonies, not on the pattern of the infamous Devil's Island, but somewhat after the model of a strong labor camp. The penologist does not and never has condoned the premature release of the vicious, professional or antisocial criminal, through political intervention, through lack of knowledge as to his characteristics or through any lack of courage in the disposition of his case. But such a realization does not alter the fact that the dangerous criminal, the public enemy type that is played up with such dramatic fervor in the press, forms but a small percentage of the total number of those who engage

the attention of the penal system. The Federal Prison Bureau has supervision over more than 40,000 convicted offenders, 17,000 of whom are in institutions, and yet only 300 are in Alcatraz. Curious, isn't it, that the interest in the 300 men on the rock seems to outweigh and overbalance the fortunes of the majority for whom society has infinitely larger responsibility?

Of the 520,153 arrests recorded in the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 1937, 1.3 were for homicide, 2.6 for robbery. It is on account of the overwhelming proportion of minor or accidental offenders that we must demand the establishment of a rehabilitative prison system and a protective system of parole. Whether they serve a long or short time, it is the date of their emergence with which we are concerned. Obviously, there is a limit to the time that they can be kept incarcerated. Many careful students of contemporary history have insisted that in America that time is too long.

Foreign commentators have repeatedly expressed their amazement at the average length of sentence imposed in this country, especially for sex crimes. When we are able to look at this whole question not in terms of our own feeling, not on the basis of our own desire for revenge, not with our emotions distorted through some sadistic desire that the criminal should repay us, we shall have much less difficulty in accepting parole as the inevitable sequence of every prison term. And we shall look at this penal device in much the same way as the average prisoner looks at it today, namely, as an additional burden or restriction on his liberty and a consequent safeguard for the public.

Perhaps some of our more truculent editors, who are continuously and unreasonably attempting to make parole a scapegoat, have not taken the trouble to investigate the cases where parole boards have erred, not on the side of

leniency but on the score of severity. Mistakes of this sort rarely come to the attention of the public. All they do is to make the prison warden's job that much harder, to further engender feelings of resentment in the heart of the prisoner. But ample evidence can be adduced in support of the theory that more often does a parole board, perhaps through fear of criticism, prolong the sentence beyond the time when it is necessary for true reformation, rather than unduly shorten it.

The phase of this whole question which sometimes makes it more difficult for the public to understand is the tendency through the processes of law, or by practice in many states, to impose excessively long maximum sentences in order that a lengthy period of supervision may inevitably follow the prison term, sentences the length of which neither the legislature nor the court ever intended to be served in prison in their entirety. And yet when any diminution from this maximum results, certain members of the public seem to feel that they have been cheated out of something. Likewise, if later the criminal repeats his offense under circumstances whereby under earlier systems he would have been classified merely as an ex-convict, he is now referred to as a parolee and the parole board becomes jointly responsible with him for his new crime. It is remarkable to what a greater degree the paroling authority is held responsible than some of the other agencies of criminal law-enforcement in this respect. The local police may overlook on countless occasions instances of law violations which should have been followed, perhaps, by arrest. A district attorney may and often does decide not to prosecute. The jury may acquit the defendant for perhaps the most fantastic reason, and the court may impose a sentence far below the maximum sentence possible in the case, and yet these representatives of law-enforcement almost uniformly escape

responsibility or criticism if the defendant later commits another crime.

I am confident that it will not be difficult for social workers to believe that not all discharged prisoners are filthy reptiles. They know too much of the social and economic causes of crime. In the two decades that I have formed some acquaintance with prisons and their occupants, I have seen not only gunmen and bandits, public enemies and drug addicts, pickpockets and slick confidence men, men with such crooked characters that they never feel at home except in the atmosphere of crime, but also men who were reasonably successful in business until the depression hit them, men whose families still loved them for what they had once been, men who took the rap for someone even more guilty than themselves rather than be classed as yellow, men whose offenses were so close to the line of what is a crime and what is not a crime that it took a supreme court or two to determine whether they were criminals or not, clean looking young men paying a high penalty for an exciting adventure, cripples, children, feeble-minded individuals, psychopaths, and I have also seen in prison bankers, judges, governors, and congressmen. One cannot brand all men who have been in prison with eternal obloquy. Those men who fail on parole may have their names spread before a public eager for sensation and quick to reprobate them, but thousands who survive the searing effect of a prison experience, to whom parole has been a needed second chance, cannot be advertised. To the credit of the much maligned parole authorities must go their steadfast refusal to embarrass the men who have served a term in prison and who have succeeded nevertheless.

Comparing Results

Let us see then if we can submit the question of a humanitarian approach toward the prisoner and his treat-

ment to any sort of critical, unemotional evaluation. It seems to be quite popular nowadays to submit all our cherished theories to searching surveys and evaluations. In fact, social workers, private and public, are apt to fall into two classes—those who do the evaluating and those who have to put up with it. The Wickersham Commission told us what was wrong with our prisons. They were not so clear as to what to do about it. The Gluecks took a rap at the conventional reformatory and then proceeded to lay waste the juvenile court. The Children's Bureau, albeit with a tolerant and friendly spirit, made it look pretty bad for the juvenile training schools. What we want to know today is, does the kind of penal system which subordinates the desire for revenge to the need for rehabilitation really work? Should we be better off if we had chain gangs and whipping posts and gloomy dungeons in all of our states? Is it more important to put the fear of punishment into the minds of potential criminals than to try to reclaim the unfortunate who have set out upon the "primrose path of dalliance"? Is probation a more effective method than recourse to the jail or the reformatory or the penitentiary? For twenty years I have tried to find some satisfying answers to these questions. But I doubt if we shall ever be able to answer them to the complete satisfaction of the more skeptical. Probation may be entirely futile in one case where condign punishment, administered in the right proportion, might have been effective. Communities and their resources for rehabilitation differ greatly. Some reformatories are equipped with conscientious personnel and the paraphernalia for reform. Others are places, to enter which is to abandon hope. Some individuals will survive or even profit from reformatory discipline and some will be crushed or degraded by it.

I have thought of only one real basis upon which we

might evaluate the effectiveness of penal treatment. We can compare results between states or communities where different methods or policies obtain. And in doing this we have at our disposal some statistics which, while they may not be accurate, are at least susceptible of comparison. I believe that the statistics obtained from the reports of the Census Bureau¹ and the Uniform Crime Reports² establish the fact that where reasonably humanitarian prison administration has been undertaken, and probation and parole have been freely administered, the crime rates are low. Where we have a good parole system we have less crime. I am obliged to use the 1935 report of the Census Bureau because while the 1936 report is published it does not contain prison commitments on a comparable basis. I select four states, those in which I think you will readily agree that probation and parole are well developed — Massachusetts, New Jersey, Wisconsin and New York. And I select four other states in which these systems are rather inadequately developed and considerable insistence upon the efficacy of punishment still exists.

The Census Bureau reports indicate for the year 1935 the number of prisoners received in prison per 100,000 population for the whole of the United States as 74.4.

Massachusetts	30.2
New Jersey	49.4
Wisconsin	46.2
New York	29.2
<hr/>	
Oklahoma	167.2
Florida	106.2
Virginia	108.5
Arkansas	96.4

If the formula that punishment prevents crime holds good, one would expect to find that those states which

1. *Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1935*, Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce.

2. *Uniform Crime Reports, 1937*, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U. S. Department of Justice.

send the most men to prison would have the least crime, but we find that the exact converse has been proved. The Uniform Crime Reports for 1937, the last completed year of statistics gathered by the Department of Justice, show on page 194 the rate of offenses known to the public per 100,000 of population to be as follows:

	<i>Murder and Manslaughter</i>	<i>Robbery</i>	<i>Larceny and Theft</i>
Oklahoma	8.1	73.0	1314.9
Florida	22.6	124.1	1586.6
Virginia	19.8	79.7	1501.5
Arkansas	17.4	79.8	1124.7
Massachusetts ...	1.3	23.6	476.6
New Jersey	3.4	31.7	518.4
Wisconsin	1.5	11.3	620.7
New York	3.7	16.5	426.6

Now, of course, it would be unsafe to draw too many deductions from this striking comparison. There are many complicating factors in the whole picture. There is the stubborn problem of racial relations. There are cultural, economic and social differences in some of these states. These facts, instead of disproving my point merely emphasize and reenforce the fundamental proposition which I advance. Admitting that in the more progressive group of states it is not the withholding of punishment *alone* that has stopped crime, nevertheless these commonwealths still constitute a shining example of what can be done when a community-wide effort at character building and preventive social work is undertaken. I submit that these figures do positively prove the fact that we cannot rely upon penal processes alone if we are to have a crime-free state.

I believe there are other contemporary evidences that bear directly upon the truth of this proposition. The Advisory Committee on Education has recently published

some reports included in which is a table indicating the current expenditure per pupil and child in the various states for the year 1935-36.

<i>State</i>	<i>Expenditure Per Pupil</i>	<i>Robbery Rate</i>
New York	134.13	16.5
New Jersey	108.33	31.7
Massachusetts	104.51	23.6
Rhode Island	95.03	7.8
Connecticut	90.76	16.4
Minnesota	86.16	42.4
Tennessee	35.81	116.6
North Carolina	31.11	71.7
Georgia	30.96	128.0
Alabama	28.49	53.8
Arkansas	24.55	79.8

Is it not worthy of notice that almost without exception the states that spend the largest amount of money for the education of their children are the states with the low crime rates, and that the states which I have quoted to you above as having high crime rates are found grouped together in the extreme lower brackets?

Likewise, I believe it is of more than ordinary significance that the robbery rate in the city of Boston, which contributed nearly \$4 per capita to the Community Fund, last year was 46 per 100,000, whereas the people of Atlanta contributed \$1.37 apiece to the Community Chest and its robbery rate was 218.

It will not be enough for any state merely to mitigate the horrors of its prison administration unless the people of that state are prepared to supplement such reforms with an enlargement of parole and probation activities and with a community-wide program of social work and character building agencies. It is no mere coincidence that in many of the communities to which I have referred as being relatively free of crime we find the landscape dotted with well-supervised Boys' Clubs and other community-

supported leisure-time agencies. I have recently commented upon a certain interpretation of some of the contemporary crime figures. It seems to me so suggestive of our opportunity in this whole problem that I am going to take the time to refer to it again.

One of the accepted ways of arousing people to action is to tell them that crime is increasing and that the age of criminals is decreasing or that the number of sex crimes is alarmingly high. Of these three statements, however, only the third is strictly true. Referring again to the Uniform Crime Reports of the Department of Justice it is shown that while there is an upturn in the amount of major crimes from 1936 to 1937, there is a decrease in the annual trends of offenses known to the police from the reporting area for the period 1931-37.

Daily Average

Year	Murder, non-negligent manslaughter	Manlaughter by negligence	Rape	Robbery	Assault	Burglary	Larceny	Auto Theft
1931	4.5	4.1	3.5	60.0	30.5	216.4	453.8	262.7
1932	4.5	3.2	3.6	56.8	26.8	230.4	461.2	223.7
1933	4.8	3.8	3.6	54.7	33.1	238.9	495.6	214.8
1934	4.4	2.6	3.8	46.5	30.7	226.9	497.8	197.7
1935	3.9	2.5	4.4	38.9	29.4	206.9	490.7	169.5
1936	3.9	2.7	4.6	36.4	31.7	184.0	465.5	146.6
1937	4.0	3.2	5.2	42.1	30.3	197.1	519.0	150.3

God forbid that we should profess complacency over this situation. Our national crime figures by 1931 had attained truly alarming proportions. The fact that they have receded from that time is no particular cause for gratification except as such a trend indicates whether or not we are on the right track. When I say, therefore, that from 1931 to 1938 murder decreased 12 per cent, manslaughter 20 per cent, robbery 30 per cent, burglary 9

per cent, and auto theft 45 per cent, I do not mean to indicate that the situation is now satisfactory. I think we can admit, however, that the trend is in the right direction. These tables indicate that there has been an increase in crime in the seven years in only two of the major categories. One was larceny and theft, which due to the sharp increase in 1937 was 14 per cent more than in 1931; but the amazing and disheartening fact disclosed by these tables is that the crime of rape has increased 50 per cent throughout the country in seven years.

The Sex Offender

To what may we attribute this situation? Well, a year or more ago one or two atrocious crimes were committed in New York by a man whom we call a sex offender and whom many newspapers for an inexplicable reason called a "moron." Certain of the newspapers immediately tried to connect this situation with the failure of the parole system. They asseverated that no man who committed a sex crime should ever be released from an institution. Mothers were terrified by and school children warned against prowling sex offenders. The fact that sex criminals have always been the best parole risks was overlooked. But it did not take long for the New York State Parole Board to make its position clear with reference to this matter. The able Governor of the State of New York, Herbert H. Lehman, who has the courage to state his convictions, said before the New York State Probation Officers' Association:

"The State Board of Parole was organized and became operative under the present law on July 1, 1930. It therefore completed a full seven years of operation on June 30 last. In that period there came out of state prisons and from the Elmira Reformatory either through action of the parole board or by statutory release, 925 individuals who had served sentences for those repulsive crimes. In those seven years in the whole state

only eight of those 925 released prisoners were convicted of new sex offenses. This, however, portrays only part of the parole operation. In those seven years, 33 individuals in this class who were on parole were arrested and charged with the commission of new sex felonies. With 8 convicted and resentenced the parole board was left to deal with 25 who were not convicted. In every instance, even though no new conviction was secured, parole was terminated by action of the parole board and the parolee returned to state prison as a parole violator.

"Carrying my inquiry along this line somewhat further I found that in addition to the 33 parolees arrested for new sex offenses the State Board of Parole, on its own initiative, declared delinquent for suspected sex misconduct another 24 parolees. This means a grand total of 57. Eight of the 57 went back to prison under new convictions. Forty-six went back to prison on the initiative of the parole board. Had we not had parole this would have been impossible save on fresh convictions. In the three remaining cases the delinquency declared for technical violations was cancelled and the parolees were returned to active parole supervision.

"It is interesting to note that not a single one of the major sex felonies—the atrocious murders committed in this state in recent years—was committed by an individual on parole to the New York State Board of Parole or who was out of prison by the authority of that board at the time the murder was committed."

A protracted treatment of this subject by the press of New York, which naturally, being spicy reading, interested the people of that city, resulted in a study of sex crimes in New York City by the Citizens' Committee on the Control of Crime. They considered in some detail the cases of 657 defendants charged with sex crimes during a period of six months. Eighty-two of the 657 had had prior records. Twenty-two had been charged with sex offenses. Thirteen of the 22 previously charged with sex offenses were convicted on the new charges. Of the whole number only one was on parole at the time of his arrest on the present charge, and at the time of the study that one man was in a hospital for the insane. Assuming that this study is a typical one and can be matched by similar

findings the country over, here is a situation for the social worker, the sociologist, and Mr. John Q. Citizen to ponder.

The one crime throughout the country that is showing an alarming rate of increase is the crime of rape, the crime which according to the New York study cannot be laid to faulty prison administration or to loose parole. Do we need any more dramatic demonstration of the fact that crime, at least this kind of crime, is being manufactured in and by our communities faster than our penal procedures can cope with it? You as social workers will know something of the economic, cultural, social and industrial changes that may share the responsibility for this situation. You can select any or all of the following causes or no doubt add to them: unemployment and consequent idleness; lurid accounts of sex crimes which appear in public print, sex stories in magazines, movies, etc.; the changed attitude toward women from that of chivalry to equality with men; break down of family controls; the absence of any substitute for the restraining force and idealism of religion; the increase in the use of alcohol and drugs among young people, particularly the recently discovered and all too prevalent use of marijuana, aided and abetted by ill-timed and dramatic publicity among young people.

Recent reports from Leavenworth Annex show that many more individuals have been committed to that institution during the last year charged with the excessive use of the aphrodisiacal drug marijuana alone. Obviously, there are two kinds of sex criminals. The congenital, professional, habitual sex criminal, the dangerous degenerate, whatever the cause of his condition, is a public menace, and should be treated much as a social leper. But for the far larger number of occasional offenders, society must face its own responsibility.

It may be that prisons are "spewing forth vermin" who commit their degenerate deeds on innocent children. It may be that, as is inevitable in prisons and reformatories, the lowest type of individuals foregather there (and where else would you expect or hope to find the lowest type?) and that degeneracy is intensified, but never again after these surveys can we lay the sole blame for this situation at the door of the Big House. Thus does the prison bequeath to society as a whole the solution of the problem of crime.

I refer once more to the possibility that we are being forced to overdo the matter of punishment in America. Informal figures whose accuracy cannot be guaranteed were released by the Howard League for Penal Reform in England two years ago and disclosed the disquieting fact that we were sending six times as many men to prison in America as in England. Has this practice made us any freer from crime? Is there any connection between the fact that while the rate of prison commitments doubled from 1910 to 1935 in this country the rate of recidivism was increased? That the women's prisons and reformatories of this country, which partake the least of the character of prisons, have the highest percentage of success with their graduates has been constantly testified to by foreign observers. If this fact is significant, and if the comparisons which I have given you above are sound, may we not assume that while we have much further to go toward the development of a humanitarian, progressive penal system before we can class it as a real protection to the public, still we do have one signpost on the road?

There are undeniably great inconsistencies in our American penal system. I have no doubt there are inconsistencies in our own attitudes toward the criminal. There are times when we become exasperated and we

join in a more or less universal demand that punishment be made more swift and sure and that justice be meted out inexorably to every person who offends against the law. But there are other times when we cannot escape the realization that crime and delinquency are the inevitable consequences of inadequate social conditions. A gunman does not become a gunman over night. He as a public enemy has had a long apprenticeship in an atmosphere of neglect, suspicion, thwarted ambitions and misunderstanding in the community.

Delinquency as a Symptom

Whether you believe in the efficacy of punishment or in the possibility of redemption you cannot but accept the conclusion that it is infinitely more vital to prevent the commission of crime in the first instance than to repair the damage after it has been done.

Of all the many recent sociological studies that have emphasized this conclusion, none perhaps has said it any more succinctly and truly than did J. B. Maller in his recent study of juvenile delinquency in New York City:

Delinquency is an unmistakable symptom of social maladjustment, and can be removed only by the elimination of the causes of such maladjustment.

The characteristics of delinquency areas are congestion, poor housing and lack of recreational facilities (playgrounds, athletic fields, swimming pools, etc.) . . .

Improvement of living conditions, strengthening of the morale in the home, and adjusting the school to the needs of the community would reduce the incidence of personal and social maladjustment which are the fundamental causes of delinquency.

I have not much patience, however, with those who believe that crime can be prevented by a campaign or a parade or even a banquet. Only as we make our neighborhoods safer and happier places in which to live, through the long slow but invaluable processes of under-

standing them better, can we really prevent crime. The schools are commencing to feel their responsibility and communities are organizing their "area projects." But our concern for the leisure-time activities of our boys and girls is growing in intensity. If there is such a thing as leadership for leisure we must try to provide it. We cannot obliterate the *gang* but we can give it a chance to become a *group*. We need not worry about preventing crimes by the underprivileged boy if we stop breeding him in underprivileged areas and committing crimes against him.

Erecting a bulwark against commercialized vice and an immunity against the onslaught of those who would make money out of tempting youth, must go hand in hand with the control of these sinister influences.

This is not the place to discuss all the methods society must employ or the sacrifices we ourselves must make if crime is to be controlled. It is a great gratification to me that I have recently become enrolled with that historic and useful organization, the Boys' Clubs of America, representing a very practical kind of social work. Under expert leadership (and this does not necessarily mean the police) they have a task of inestimable value to perform. The theme of our last annual convention was "The Boys' Club in a Changing Community." We are anxious to take our place with the great professions in a united attack upon the forces of evil both within and without.

Let us see to it, therefore, that: (1) wherever it is possible to successfully cure delinquency through probation we attempt to do so, and to this end we demand that probation be disassociated from political control; (2) the prisons and reformatories devote themselves not to merely carrying out the penalty of the law but to the more important and difficult task of refitting their inmates for the resumption of life on the outside; (3) we

cease our demand that parole be abolished, that we recognize it as the inevitable and protective sequence to every prison term, and that we demand that it be properly understood, supported and administered; (4) in all these efforts we command the services of the most intelligent workers, that we pursue the scientific method, and that our object be the long-time protection of our country rather than exacting a payment for wrongs done; (5) even as we resolutely set about to bring the prisons of the country to higher standards we never fail to look through and beyond the prison until we recognize crime in all its ramifications as a social problem, as a problem that cannot be solved by the government alone, but only by the participation of all character building agencies reinforced by the intelligent and highly motivated and unified determination of our communities themselves.

From the foldings of its robe the spirit brought two children. Wretched, abject, frightful, hideous, miserable. . . . They were a boy and a girl. Yellow, meager, ragged, scowling, wolfish, but prostrate too in their humility. Where graceful youth should have filled their features out and touched them with its freshest tints, a stale and shrivelled hand, like that of age, had pinched and twisted them, and pulled them into shreds. Where angels might have sat enthroned, devils lurked and glared out menacing. No change, no degradation, no perversion of humanity has monsters half so terrible and dread.

Scrooge . . . tried to say they were fine children but the words choked themselves rather than be parties to a lie of such enormous magnitude.

"Spirit! are they yours?" Scrooge could say no more.

"They are man's," said the spirit looking down upon them, "and they cling to me appealing from their fathers. This boy is *Ignorance*. This girl is *Want*. Beware them both and all their degree, but most of all beware this boy, for on his brow I see that written which is doom, unless the writing be erased."

"Have they no refuge or resources?" cried Scrooge.

"Are there no prisons?" said the spirit, turning on him for the last time with his own words. "Are there no workhouses?" The bell struck twelve.



A National Program to Develop Probation and Parole

JOSEPH N. ULMAN

Judge, Supreme Bench, Baltimore City

LEGAL biographers still debate whether Mr. Justice Holmes was a great liberal or a greater conservative; but all are agreed upon his greatness. He had an influence upon the lives and thoughts of his professional brethren, moreover, that is seldom mentioned. I refer, of course, to his habit of reading detective stories. Ever since this foible of the great man became known, our leading lawyers everywhere let it be whispered of them that they seek like relaxation from their burdensome cares. As for judges, every judge who indulges the fantasy that some day a quirk of fate will reward his exceptional merits with a seat on the Supreme Court,—and which of us has not secretly dreamed this dream?—admits shyly that while he prefers biography, or economics, or a bit of Greek philosophy, nevertheless he *does* like a good detective story.

Now I rise to voice a personal disclaimer. Whatever the effect upon my career, regardless of your judgment upon me, heedless of your disfavor, quite recklessly, I announce that I do *not* read detective stories. I don't read them because I don't like them,—and if this be treason, make the most of it!

So now, having made my confession I think I'll *tell* you a detective story. It is a true story and it has a moral. Everything about it is true except the names of the prisoners. A Victorian delicacy leads me to disguise these; a proper pride might cause me to suppress my own con-

nection with it,—for certainly I am not the hero of the tale. Let me first set the stage.

TIME: the present.

PLACE: the criminal court of Baltimore—but it might be the criminal court of almost any other American city.

DRAMATIS PERSONAE: *William Lewis* and *Harry Fulton*, the prisoners at the bar; *Philip Coulson*, the prosecuting attorney, a personable young man who does his duty firmly yet kindly; a *grocer* who was discreet in the face of danger; an observant *filling station attendant*; *myself*, the *presiding judge*, the embodiment of the law, which is everything that's excellent; *policemen, detectives, court attendants*, and a *long black revolver*. Also several *cartridges* loaded with *dum-dum bullets*.

The trial, both dignified and expeditious, followed close upon the heels of good policing. Therefore there was no opportunity for effective maneuvering by way of defense; the defendants had been caught red-handed, and wisely entered pleas of guilty. The charges included burglary, larceny of an automobile, and robbery with a deadly weapon. The desperate criminals thus accused were two boys, each eighteen years old. William Lewis looked and acted older than his years. He swaggered when he walked to the witness stand, told his story with an air of braggadocio, took his medicine without the flicker of an eyelid. Harry Fulton was more subdued, paler, thinner, a weakling compared with his pal.

The defendants having been arraigned, and their pleas taken, Philip Coulson made his statement as prosecuting attorney. At 10:45 p.m. on the evening of March 19 a call to headquarters reported the theft of an old Buick

sedan, license number 42366. This was flashed at once over the radio to the police patrol cars equipped to receive such messages. Two hours later a keen-eyed police sergeant saw the stolen automobile parked near a filling station about five miles from where it had been taken. The car was empty. The sergeant and his assisting officer went into the filling station for information.

The filling station attendant proved to be a very intelligent young man. He had noticed the car when it drove up because he expected to make a sale. But the two boys drove a few feet beyond the pumps, parked the car, got out, and came into the station with no apparent purpose. The attendant watched them closely "just because they seemed so aimless." After a few moments he had to turn to wait on a customer. When he looked again, the boys had left. He had no notion why they had come into his place; but the car was still there. So the police officers went into hiding where they could keep their eyes on both the stolen car and the inside of the filling station.

After about half an hour two youngsters walked slowly down the street and into the station. The attendant gave the officers a prearranged signal and conspicuously turned his back on his visitors. The sergeant then saw Lewis stoop over a trash-can in a corner of the station, pick something out of it, and walk quickly to the stolen car. As he stepped into it a service revolver was held close to his side and he was told to halt. It was as well that the sergeant took this precaution, for Lewis turned quickly and attempted to draw a .38 from his inside coat pocket. But he realized that he was covered and submitted quietly to arrest.

Meanwhile Fulton had walked to the other side of the filling station where he too stooped and took something out of a waste basket. The other policeman arrested him as he walked out of the door.

Taken to the police station and searched, each young bandit was found to have just \$15.20 in a neatly wrapped package. These packages turned out to be the articles taken from the trash can and the waste basket in the filling station. Lewis' gun was a .38 caliber Colt's revolver, fully loaded. The bullets were snubnosed dum-dums freshly filed into that deadly shape.

The police got the boys to talk without any trouble, and they repeated their stories on the witness stand with equal freedom. They had met for the first time about two months before in the city jail. Fulton was there serving a sixty day term for larceny of an automobile; Lewis was finishing a somewhat longer term, six months for burglary. They were released at about the same time.

Lewis' first concern after his release was to procure a weapon. He did so by breaking into a hardware store at night. The .38 Colt was his reward. This crime was not traced to him until after this later arrest, when he rather boastfully told of it. The cartridges he had purchased. He said he didn't know just why he filed off the noses of the bullets, but he "supposed it would improve them."

Neither was able to get a job after their release from jail. Both had homes with food and clothing enough; but spending money was not plentiful. On the evening of March 19 they were walking down the street together when they saw the Buick at a curb with a bunch of keys hanging from the ignition switch. They got in and drove away. At first they had no definite plan; but after a little while they decided to drive to Lewis' house where he picked up his gun and a halfpint bottle of whiskey.

The place they decided to stick up was a corner grocery near Lewis' home. Therefore, when they entered it, Lewis tied a handkerchief round his face as a mask, because he knew the grocer would recognize him. As a

matter of fact the grocer, who testified briefly after Mr. Coulson had finished his statement, said he was so scared when he found himself looking into the muzzle of the 38 that he recognized neither Lewis nor the unmasked Fulton who emptied the cash register. "Something must of told me them bullets was dum-dums," he said; and the bailiffs called, "Silence!" as nervous laughter ran through the courtroom.

The grocer's cash register yielded just \$35.40. This the young bandits divided into three parts, two of \$15.20 each, the third of \$5 for immediate use. They drove to the filling station on the outskirts of the city, where they selected the trashcan and wastebasket as temporary safe-deposit boxes for their two larger packages of money; then, with commendable frugality, they went to a nearby saloon and dancehall to spend \$5 on a preliminary party. From there they planned to drive out of town, trade the old Buick for the first available newer and speedier car, and keep moving. They regarded the gun and the dum-dum bullets as so much working capital and felt sure they had a long and successful career ahead of them.

That's about all there was to the trial. The defendants were not first offenders; both had been on probation from the juvenile court before they were sixteen; both had served short terms in jail after passing that mystical age. We have a psychiatrist attached to our court, and I might have ordered a psychiatric examination. But this had been done in the juvenile court and both defendants were reported as somewhat retarded mentally but quite sane by all legal tests. We have, too, a probation department with a small staff of competent officers each carrying a case load so heavy that anything like intensive probationary supervision is out of the question. So I had to impose sentence.

Lewis, who stole the revolver, was guilty of three

crimes; Fulton of but two. Moreover, Lewis was undoubtedly the prime mover in the whole enterprise. Therefore he should receive the severer sentence. But what should the sentence be,—and what might be expected to result from it? There they stood before the bar of justice; in years, in maturity, in judgment, merely two children. But they had proved themselves two very dangerous children. The grocer testified he heard a click when the revolver was pointed at him. "Sure, I meant to let him have it if he made any trouble!" Lewis answered when asked if he had cocked the gun. Society has to be protected against children of this kind as against mad dogs.

So Lewis was sentenced to seven years in the penitentiary, Fulton to six years in the house of correction. And the embodiment of the law, which is everything that's excellent, hangs his head in shame.

For I know that these children will come out of their prisons when the appointed time rolls round, seasoned criminals in the prime of vigorous young physical manhood. They will come out after years of close daily association with oldtimers. They will come out after years of semi-idleness spent in earnest endeavor to perfect themselves in the techniques of the underworld. They will come out; they will commit new crimes; they will go back again. Unless perhaps next time Lewis' victim "makes trouble":—then a widow with her fatherless children will await the hollow comfort of the news that Lewis has been hanged.

Protection of society? Is that the purpose of the criminal law? It ought to be. Nobody will dispute that.

What have I done to protect society? For a few years I have placed two bad boys, two social misfits, two dangerous young bandits, where they can do no harm. That is all I could do with the tools society has given me to work with. But I have done what I did with my eyes

wide open to the tragic futility of it. I have done my sorry best, with the full knowledge that I did a rotten job. It wouldn't be so bad to preside in the criminal court if the judge were as blind as Justice.

So that's the way we do things in Maryland. Just why I should have come all the way out to Seattle to tell you about it puzzles me. Certainly you can do no worse. In fact, here in the West you have demonstrated a wisdom and a fearless freedom from the bonds of tradition that make us of the East rub our eyes in amazement. Eastern judges would feel that their sacred prerogatives were ruthlessly invaded if they lost control over length of sentence as is the case in California, Washington and most notably in Utah. Many of us have never even heard of your laws that require judges to impose the maximum term provided for the offense and leave to a board of prison terms and paroles the subsequent determination of the actual term of imprisonment. It would be impossible in a short address for me to discuss with you the relative advantages and nice distinctions among the several plans you have developed. But I must take time to congratulate all of you upon the progress you have made and to say that it impresses me even more favorably than your climate and your scenery. Perhaps there is a subtle connection between the pure air of your high mountains and your advanced social thinking.

My own familiarity with the things you are trying to do comes to me, of course, not in my capacity as a Baltimore judge, but because of the opportunities I have enjoyed as a member of the board of Prison Industries Reorganization Administration. Appointed by President Roosevelt to work in cooperation with the several states in their efforts to deal with the shocking evils of idleness in prison, we took the stand from the very beginning that no effective results could be hoped for unless each state

penal system was studied and developed as a whole. Work programs and educational programs worth while cannot be developed in overcrowded institutions. Classification of inmates according to their individual needs and potentialities is impossible without various types of institutions for the many different kinds of persons confined within them. And everywhere we have found that there has been too much reliance upon stone walls and iron bars as the principal measures for the protection of society. Everywhere we have found men behind the bars, hundreds of them in some states, against whom society could protect itself equally well by supervision under probation or on parole. In every institution, also, we have found men about to be released because of expiration of sentence who are practically certain to commit new crimes and return once more to prison.

Individual Treatment

Quite obviously, we need to attack crime more intelligently. I do not fear the sneers of those who try to make the public believe that probation and parole are twin daughters of darkness. I stand firmly upon the rock that each person convicted of crime is an individual human being who must be studied as an individual and treated as an individual. If he has in him the capabilities that go to the making of a useful and law-abiding citizen then a society that fails to develop those capabilities and is content merely to punish him is as foolish as it is without mercy. But if he is a hard-boiled criminal, if he is a social menace today and likely to be a social menace tomorrow, then society must think in terms only of its own protection. Permanent segregation, even elimination by death, are the only appropriate treatment for some offenders. But let this be determined in respect of each individual

by a cool and dispassionate study made by trained persons, not by emotional outburst or subtly stimulated popular outcry.

This personal evaluation of the individual offender must begin when he is tried for his crime, and must be continued systematically in every succeeding stage of his treatment. You in the West have done well to provide by statute that release on probation may never be ordered until probation officers have made a thorough case study and submitted a written report to the sentencing judge. Mere courtroom impressions are no safe guide. I know because I have been fooled by them so often. So, too, release on parole should rest upon the even better data available when the social case history of the prisoner before his incarceration is supplemented by the information that trained psychologists and intelligent prison officials can supply concerning his activities during imprisonment.

Flatly, then, I urge the greater use of probation. And I restate the obvious when I say that no prisoner should ever be released except on parole. At the same time, I insist upon the sternest measures and long terms for the professional criminal, the gangster, and the public enemy, whatever his number. I insist further, that there is no inconsistency in these aims. On the contrary, they all proceed from an identical base,—that each offender is an individual and that the effective protection of society requires his treatment as an individual. For this we may need new types of institutions. We certainly do need to think and plan more intelligently than has been our habit.

Probably the most impressive need of all is to improve our administration of both probation and parole. I have some sympathy with those who condemn these important devices of modern penology. Some of them go too far and it is hard to forgive them for building up an unthink-

ing public resentment against what are at once the most humane and the most intelligently constructive measures for controlling crime and reclaiming criminals. But the fault is largely our own. Too often we are content with halfway measures. Is there a man in this room to challenge the assertion that most probation departments, most parole departments, are shockingly undermanned? Does anybody really believe that this most difficult kind of social case work can be done properly by an officer required to supervise two hundred or more cases? Does anybody really believe that probationers or parolees who are visited once in six months, or are not visited at all and report by mail,—does anybody really believe that these men are under helpful and controlling supervision?

Yet most of us are willing to put up with these conditions on the theory that half a loaf is better than no bread. I am not so sure about that. Sometimes I think it might be better to go to our legislatures and say frankly that probation and parole can be made valuable agencies of social control if they are supported adequately, but that they are a menacing source of danger to society if the states keep them on starvation rations. No officer, however well trained, however intelligent, however industrious, can do a decent job if he has to supervise more than fifty probationers. Those who hold the purse strings must be made to know this elementary fact. Until they are ready to act on it, perhaps it might be better to shut up shop.

The crime story with which I began my talk is, of course, one of many, all differing in detail, all alike in their essential social folly. Every day, in every part of this enlightened land, the obsolescent machinery of criminal justice creaks and groans as it takes young men into its maw, crushes every vestige of decent manhood out of them, and throws them back to fester in society.

A Study of Cases

An unusually effective presentation of what is happening is contained in a recent book to which I want to refer at some length, *Youth in the Toils*, by Leonard V. Harrison and Pryor McNeill Grant.¹ This is no piece of sensational muck-raking, but a calm, objective study by scientists. Its great strength lies in its admirable restraint.

The authors base their interesting and provocative conclusions upon an intensive study of the cases of several hundred young persons arrested, tried, and imprisoned in the city of New York. The story of social ineptitude begins when these delinquents are examined at detective headquarters and follows through as they wait in the Tombs for the day of trial. Between arrest and trial the boy unable to give bail is subjected to treatment calculated, as by design, to make him a real criminal. And then he is tried before busy judges whose crowded dockets force them to apply a mechanized and legalistic procedure that takes little account of the problem of human maladjustment presented by each case. Finally, if a prison term is imposed the young criminal goes to a reformatory or a prison in which the mass incarceration of hundreds or even thousands of inmates makes almost impossible any effective work of rehabilitation. When at last he is released on parole, he has come to think that the world is his enemy and that crime is his only trade. He resents the supervision of his parole officer and refuses to believe that anybody wants to help him go straight.

So much of *Youth in the Toils* as describes the workings and the disastrous effects of our present system is a story all too familiar to students of criminology. It is the story of our greatest and most costly social failure. The authors have given it fresh dramatic values by including

1. Harrison, Leonard V.; Grant, Pryor McNeill, *Youth in the Toils* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938).

in their text a great number of significant case histories; and the fact that their study is confined to the cases of persons under twenty-one years of age still in the relatively pliant and formative period of life, makes the tragedy of these cases particularly poignant.

Many others have used similar material, few with such telling effect. The special value of the present book is in the planned remedy, or rather the planned set of remedies the authors have worked out. There is nothing novel about their proposals unless it is that they are presented as parts of a planned and integrated whole. The authors remember always that the young person who is arrested and detained before trial in a physically and morally filthy jail, is the same young person, the same human being, throughout every stage of what follows. In this insistence upon the human *nexus* that binds together the whole process of enforcement of the criminal law lies the peculiar value of this study.

The system proposed is revolutionary only because it is rational and logical. In brief, it is that from the moment of arrest the young offender shall be studied and treated as an individual. His trial is to be conducted as informally as possible, with full regard for the preservation of his legal and constitutional rights. It is urged strongly and most persuasively that the trial court shall be organized with its fact finding division separate and distinct from its sentencing part. A judge trained conventionally in the law, with the aid of a jury if necessary, shall decide the question of guilt or innocence. Then the prisoner shall be turned over for sentence and further treatment to a disposition board composed of scientifically trained persons rather than of mere lawyers. This proposal might have seemed radical a few years ago but today it is almost a commonplace.

However, and this is by far the most important point

in the program, they have elaborated this feature of their plan to include a proposal that the disposition board shall retain jurisdiction over the offender after sentence and during the whole period of his treatment and social control. In this they recognize what all present and traditional systems ignore (even that of Utah, in part) :—that the flow of life is a continuous process and that if society is to deal efficaciously with lawbreakers we must find ways to assure a continuous treatment of them. Until now we have acted as though the lives of criminals can be divided up into a series of unconnected episodes. We have caused each episode to stand off by itself, and have designated separate sets of public officials to deal with each separate episode. We have required judges to sentence offenders to institutions they know nothing about, institutions over which they have no control. Once in the institution the prisoner has been made subject to rigid discipline taking little or no account of the development of his personality; and upon his release he has been turned over to still another set of officials, the parole officers, to whom he presents a novel human problem largely disconnected with his life up to that time.

The authors would substitute for this episodic method a unified and continuous treatment all under the direction of the disposition board. This arm of the court is to be implemented with adequate staffs of probation and parole officers and is to have under its direct control a graduated series of facilities and institutions ranging through supervised homes, small hostels, special training schools, work camps, penal colonies and prisons. The board is to have power to subject delinquents to treatment in such of these facilities as may from time to time prove desirable and to release them either conditionally on parole or unconditionally into freedom when they have demonstrated their fitness to be released. The psychologist and the educator

will take the place of the typical prison guard as inspirational leader and moral guide; emphasis throughout will be on the rehabilitation of those susceptible of reform. On the other hand, the residue, about 20 per cent incapable of response to this kind of treatment, will be isolated from society for a much longer period than under our present haphazard sentencing practices; and the sorry spectacle of repeated cycles of crime, arrest, imprisonment and release will become less and less common as the new system perfects its techniques.

I like to tease myself by imagining the probable effects of such a system upon the daily grist in my own court. William Lewis and Harry Fulton, in all likelihood, would not have visited me at all last March, and would not now be taking postgraduate courses in our Maryland prisons. Each of these youngsters had committed previous offenses. The records in the juvenile court disclosed enough about their backgrounds, their homes, and their personalities to make it quite clear that the short terms in jail imposed upon them a few months before their latest exploit were worse than futile gestures. They were released when obviously unfit to move about in free society; anybody could have predicted that they would commit new crimes. Recidivism is a price we pay for our unscientific criminological practices. And recidivism, especially in the case of the youthful offender, often means a steady progression from less serious to more serious crimes as we stupidly drive the unhappy culprit deeper into his antisocial ways of living.

Youth in the Toils charts a new and better course. I have only one fault to find with it. Its proposals are confined to the treatment of delinquent minors beyond the jurisdictional age of the juvenile court. True, these present at once the most serious problem and the most hopeful material that reach our criminal courts. If we can

learn to deal with them successfully we shall go far to diminish crime; if we continue to fail with them we may as well throw up our hands in despair. Harrison and Grant have written a book that forbids despair, a book that grips the imagination of the reader and inspires him to action. The American Law Institute has initiated already a preliminary study to determine the possibilities of the wise and far-reaching legislation that it suggests; and I account it a great distinction that I have been privileged to work with Mr. Harrison and others in making this study. But there is no sound reason to limit the application of this thoroughly rational program to offenders within a limited age group. It presents a plan that applies equally well to every violator of the law, young or old,—a plan of criminal justice to take the place of the chaotic injustice that so generally prevails.

Now finally, I wonder if anybody here remembers the subject of my present speech. It is "A National Program to Develop Probation and Parole"; and though you may not have guessed the fact, I have had it in mind all the time. For I believe very earnestly that a sound program to develop probation and parole must be an integral part of a far-reaching program to reform our whole method of dealing with lawbreakers. You in the West have sensed that fundamental fact and made striking contributions to current legislation and practice. We of the East are more apt to go slowly. Tradition binds us more tightly than it does you,—often we seem to be afraid to move at all. But when all is said and done, Leonard Harrison and his co-worker, the late Pryor McNeill Grant, are products of the effete East; so we are not quite sterile.

They have sounded a progressive note that I am proud to echo. They have pointed the way toward a new system of criminal justice in which probation and parole will be used more liberally than ever before. But they insist and

I insist that the administration of probation and parole must be put on the highest possible plane of good social case work.

And I insist too that probation and parole are but parts, essential though they may be, of a planned system of penology. Standing by themselves, they may be dangerous. Integrated with a rationally planned system of criminal justice, recognized as essential features of such a system, utilized intelligently, and supported adequately, both probation and parole will take on a new dignity and importance. No one will then dare to refer to these methods of treatment as the folly of theorists or the weakness of sentimentalists. On the contrary, everyone will acclaim them as valuable aids in the protection of society and as convincing proof that we are learning to cope with crime constructively.



Ideals and Realities in the Probation Field

CHARLES L. CHUTE

Executive Director, National Probation Association

TWENTY-FIVE years ago when I entered the probation field as secretary of the New York State Probation Commission, that commission had a definition of probation which brought out the legal or correctional rather than the social service aspects of the work and placed little emphasis upon investigation or social diagnosis as an essential part of treatment. Today probation has freed itself to some extent from the older ideas of surveillance of offenders under a suspension of sentence. It is recognized as an important branch of community social work. It is now generally regarded by enlightened judges and prosecutors as an essential arm of the criminal or socialized court, indispensable for the proper diagnosis and effective treatment of a large group of early offenders and others likely to respond to case work treatment.

Probation work was begun and has been carried forward in a spirit of high idealism akin to religious devotion. It was established to save the unfortunate victim of himself or of his untoward surroundings, to reclaim him, to offer "another chance" under more favorable surroundings, to apply the power of intelligent, friendly, personal guidance, so often lacking in the lives of offenders. Probation had its beginning in Massachusetts. Men and women applied themselves to this work, at first without pay or with very inadequate salaries or as representatives of organizations working in the courts. The results were from the start encouraging. The service spread through-

out that state and then to surrounding states. More and more laws were enacted each year to authorize extension of the work into all courts and to improve standards and personnel.

Twenty-five years ago probation was a new service. Except for Massachusetts no state had had a probation law more than fifteen years. At that time there were still five states without juvenile probation laws and eighteen without any adult probation. Standards of personnel had not been established and the development of statewide probation administration was lacking in most states. The early laws were mostly permissive and of local application, allowing courts to establish probation if the judge had been sold as to the value of the services and if he could get an appropriation from his city or county. The New York State Probation Commission, the first state-supported bureau established to supervise and assist the development of probation in all courts of the state, had been in existence six years. Massachusetts was the only other state with a similar bureau. There were no well-organized state-administered probation departments then. Four states, Vermont, Rhode Island, Wisconsin and Utah, had state-paid probation directors with small and inadequate state-paid staffs, giving a limited service to a minority of their state courts. The personnel in all states was largely political and untrained.

I came into the work soon after the commission in New York State had succeeded in its efforts to classify all probation officers under the civil service—a great forward step which has done more than anything else to help make probation a profession in that state. Few other states at that time had begun to think of state examinations or any form of effective state regulation. The general opinion in those days was that almost any well-

meaning person could qualify as a probation officer. Ex-police officers or sheriffs, or their widows, kind-hearted volunteers who showed an interest or were out of a job were considered satisfactory material for probation officers.

But there were leaders then, pioneers, men and women who entered the work without special training. Few went to schools of social work in those days but often they were "born social workers," developing probation as a fine art. Edwin Cooley was then at work establishing an efficient adult probation system in Buffalo. He had selected two young men who took up the new work with great energy and enthusiasm. They were destined to head two of the largest and best county departments of today, Edward Volz of Buffalo and Joseph Murphy of Newark, New Jersey. Bernard Fagan, a real self-made children's probation officer, was serving in the ranks in New York. Afterward he was to become chief of the Greater New York Children's Court and then a parole commissioner of New York State. Albert J. Sargent, then as now, was chief of a large staff in the old Boston Municipal Court. Arthur W. Towne, first secretary of the New York State Probation Commission, contributed much to the working out of state-wide standards. In Massachusetts, Edwin Mulready, and later Herbert C. Parsons, spread the news of Massachusetts' achievements in the field of probation and at our earliest national meetings raised eloquent voices on behalf of a national organization equipped to extend the work throughout the country. In the West, Joel D. Hunter was chief of the famous Chicago juvenile court, and way out on the Pacific coast J. C. Astredo was the able director of the San Francisco juvenile court and Dr. Lilburn Merrill had come from Denver to develop the Seattle court.

We entered the work in those early days with much enthusiasm and high hopes for its rapid progress. Its claims were invincible. In place of hard-boiled, impersonal punishment on the "eye for an eye" principle, it substituted a new and more scientific method, that of individual diagnosis and friendly, understanding guidance. It made possible discrimination between the young and the old, the beginner and the hardened offender. It made the offender self-supporting and family-supporting. It was less expensive than prison care, sometimes costing only one-tenth as much. Probation, it had been shown, brought to the service of offenders in the courts and to their families the aid of clinics, social service organizations and other community agencies.

It had seemed to me, back in 1913, that before the present, date state-wide probation services would be developed in every state with adequate staffs of probation officers in every court. By now, I thought, probation, and parole work as well, would be well-recognized professions with established standards of special training and with adequate salaries. The state governments, seeing the importance and economy of the work as the intake branch of the state correctional system, would be behind it and we should have strong departments or bureaus of probation operating in every state. We had hoped that with the more general extension of the system and a more adequate personnel we should see better results and a definite decrease in serious crime throughout the country.

These were some of our ideals when the work began to develop. Perhaps we counted too much on the assets and failed to reckon enough with the liabilities and numerous difficulties in the realization of our dreams. Let us now face some of the realities in 1938.

Facing Realities

It cannot be said that as yet we have succeeded in preventing or, I believe, appreciably reducing the burden of crime in this country. Public interest and information about crime have increased tremendously, and we have begun to develop better criminal statistics, but there is not enough comparative information over the years to show whether crime is today increasing or decreasing. There is evidence of a definite decrease in cases coming before the juvenile courts throughout the country, but has there been, as some think, an increase of youthful offenders above the juvenile court age? The latest uniform crime reports from Mr. Hoover's Bureau of Investigation estimate an increase of 6.2 per cent of major crimes in 1937 as compared with 1936, but those who quote the figure forget that for several years previous to that time the number had been decreasing. Between 1933 and 1937 the Federal Bureau of Investigation reports show that there were decreases in all classes of offenses except rape. Murder, robbery and burglary had all definitely decreased in spite of greater population and a larger reporting area. But the decreases were not large and new offenses, like automobile violations, have been created by statute.

It is probable that the amount of crime in the country has remained about the same both as to the number and the seriousness of offenses. With over a million serious offenses known to the police each year and about 200,000 of these resulting in conviction, crime and its prevention is still largely an unsolved problem.

Up to a few years ago the population of our prisons and other penal institutions was definitely decreasing, but of late years it has increased, due, I believe, to longer prison terms and greater demand for severe sentences.

Our prison population is today greater than ever before. We are building bigger and I hope better prisons, but in most of our states, the prison plants inherited from a former generation have been so crowded and unsuitable for rehabilitative work as almost invariably to turn out offenders worse than when they went in. This fact, and the impossibility and the undesirability of developing institutions to adequately care for all types of offenders, have led in recent years to a realization all over the country of the need for developing more effective systems of probation and parole.

As yet, however, we have not established an even fairly complete statewide system of probation covering all courts in any state of the Union, unless we except the small states of Rhode Island and Vermont, and possibly Massachusetts. Even in these states a larger and better trained personnel is needed, and it is true that in a majority of our states any real probation system is still lacking. In others the service is adequate in only a few counties with great open spaces on the map where criminals may thrive without benefit of adequate social diagnosis or treatment, either before or after they are sentenced to prison.

Court clinics for the mental and physical examination of all offenders who need it early in their careers, are available in only a small number of the larger cities. Extrajudicial agencies cooperating with the courts and probation departments, such as protective societies and the Big Brothers and Big Sisters, at one time thought to be very helpful in the treatment of young delinquents, are now generally found lacking. Successful examples of communities equipped with all of these services may be cited, but these are the exceptions. Examples of well-organized courts and communities are valuable as demonstrating what can be accomplished, but as yet they are too few in number to have any effect on our general crime rate.

There have been many ups and downs in probation work in recent years. Progress has been made but it has been uneven, sometimes erratic, due to the passage of a new law here or the obtaining of large appropriations there. Sometimes through the work of legislative commissions or surveys new state-wide systems have come about, with new leadership. On the other hand, in a number of localities, by a change of politics or personnel, the progress of years has been set back. We understand better today the difficulties involved in grafting a new and scientific service like probation upon a tradition-bound, moss-grown institution like the criminal law, handed down to us from the dim past. We have been seeking to develop a new profession and to give it status as a branch of the public service and it has been a difficult task.

Some of the greatest difficulties we have met are a lack of public understanding of the real nature and importance of probation resulting in limited laws and meager appropriations which in turn spell low salaries and inadequate staffs. Secondly, we have encountered an evil faced by all public work in a democratic country,—namely, the constant interference of partisan politics, especially in the appointment of probation officers. These are our greatest problems. Years ago at a national probation conference, Raymond Moley summed up these handicaps in the two words, "parsimony and politics," and the *New York Times* in an editorial once characterized probation as "an underfinanced moral gesture." With low standards in the community as to the qualifications of good probation officers, and the attractiveness of the position to many persons, it has been a hard struggle to remove the job of probation officer from the "spoils" class and get it into the professional service class.

Looking Forward

I do not want to present only the darker side of the picture. Let me now describe some of the progress that has been made, especially in the last few years, and endeavor to appraise the present status of the service.

On the legislative side, new laws have been passed each year, extending probation powers to more courts, setting up new state systems or improving existing systems. Today there are only nine states without an adult probation law (and these mostly in the South) and only one state, Wyoming, has no juvenile probation law. Last year (1937) new or improved probation laws were passed in twenty-one states, more than in any previous year. This impetus shows the increased public interest all over the country. Seven states last year, and two the year before, established state departments or bureaus to administer probation. During the past five years the number of states adopting direct state administration of adult probation, whereby a state board or bureau appoints the probation officers who in turn are state-paid, has increased from three to thirteen. Of these thirteen states, four administer juvenile probation as well as adult in a state bureau, and no less than ten states administer both adult probation and parole in the same state department and with the same officers. Two smaller states, Vermont and Rhode Island, administer all their probation and parole work, adult and juvenile, in one state bureau and both have improved their service greatly in recent years. The other two states administering both juvenile and adult probation with state funds are Utah and New Hampshire.

The shift from the earlier prevailing policy of developing probation as a local service attached to the courts and financed by cities or counties, to the state plan has been a remarkable feature of probation development in

the past few years. We have come to realize, after the successful demonstration of probation under state bureaus, especially in Wisconsin and Rhode Island, that the resources of the state could and should be called upon and that only in this way can we hope for unified standards and anything like state coverage.

The enactment of the probation law for the United States District Courts in 1925 and the subsequent development of a staff of 172 officers, one or more in every federal court district except four, has served as an example and impetus toward the development of state adult probation. While the federal service is entirely inadequate as yet for the great number of probation and parole cases supervised, the quality of personnel has been good and progress has been more rapid than we expected, having in mind the revolutionary changes brought about.

The development of an adequate, trained, and non-political personnel, by far the most important need in probation or parole, has been a matter of slow and uneven progress. The number of probation officers now serving throughout the United States and Canada is, according to our last census, 4920, an increase of 725 in three years. Of the 3072 counties in the United States, 2139 or 69 per cent have probation service of some sort. Many of the officers are part time officers or paid by other agencies.

For the full time officers serving in state systems or in the larger cities and counties steady progress has been made in raising the standards of training, experience and personal fitness. This has been aided chiefly by extension of the requirement of competitive or qualifying examinations. In six states probation officers must now qualify under the civil service. In four others examination by a state board is required. In a number of separate courts the judges have instituted examinations for appointment. The highest practicable standard prerequisite to take the

examinations in larger jurisdictions is college graduation, and one year's experience in social case work or training in a school of social work. In rural areas at the start a lower minimum educational requirement is necessary.

In addition to the thirteen states with state departments or bureaus administering probation there are now twelve others with state bureaus to aid and develop probation locally. Some of these are very active in aiding the local courts and in developing standards, as for example, New York, Massachusetts and Indiana. Others have a law for state supervision but have done little work in this field due to inadequate personnel. In those states where probation is established on a local or county plan we recommend a well-organized state bureau with a full time director and staff with power to set standards, prescribe forms, make general rules and, unless there is an effective civil service, conduct examinations to qualify candidates for appointment. The plan for a state subsidy to locally appointed officers is now possible in only one state, Michigan. It is being proposed in California and New York. We hope to see other states provide such subsidies.

From these developments which I have briefly outlined, it is evident that real progress is being made to extend and improve probation service today. This is due to quickened public interest, indicated by increased discussion of the subject in newspapers and other publications, and by many conferences. In the future we may expect continued progress in developing probation as truly professional service, in making it available to all courts, coordinating it with parole on the one hand, and with all community welfare agencies on the other. When this is accomplished, and when every beginner in delinquency and crime is studied in the first instance and given an opportunity to make good under probation treatment wherever possible, a long step will be taken toward solving the crime problem of America.



The Family in Court

GEORGE W. SMYTH

Judge, Children's Court, Westchester County, New York

THE children's courts are a strange admixture of criminal and civil jurisdiction. Recently I appeared before a distinguished committee of the Constitutional Convention of the State of New York and was questioned as to why, if these courts claimed to be agencies for social service, they should be vested with jurisdiction over adults for the commission of various crimes. The crimes which are prosecuted in the children's courts of New York relate directly to the abuse or neglect of children in some form, and for the purpose of effective and concentrated action it is highly advisable that these courts continue to have such powers. This is a matter, however, as to which there is much confusion, not only in the lay mind, but in the minds of many well-informed judges of the higher courts. It may be helpful to consider how the court exercises concurrently the peculiar powers it possesses along both criminal and civil lines for the welfare or reconstruction of a family, one or more of whose members have been brought before it.

Whether the case originates in a charge of neglect or nonsupport of an entire family, or in a charge of delinquency against a single child, the treatment usually entails a strengthening of the family group. No single member of the family can be treated as such, separate and apart from the other members of the group. The unit to be studied and dealt with must always be the family.

Mrs. X and Her Children

To illustrate let us take the case of Mrs. X who was brought before the children's court some six years ago

by the Humane Society on a sworn petition alleging that she was guilty of a misdemeanor in that she had neglected her children to the extent that they needed the care and protection of the state. The specific allegation against the respondent was that while living with her six children separate and apart from her husband she had left them alone at night on frequent occasions without adult guardianship, and on the particular occasion referred to had been found in a helplessly intoxicated condition in the room of a man other than her husband with whom she had spent the night. This performance was alleged to be typical of her conduct.

At the same time the petition was filed against Mrs. X, an accompanying petition alleged that John, Mary, Agnes, Peter, Jane and William X were neglected because of the facts and circumstances above referred to. The children, having been found alone without adult supervision, had been taken into custody without court action, a course which the Society is entitled to take, provided the children are brought before the court with reasonable dispatch.

Both cases were heard together, the one a strictly criminal proceeding with penalties prescribed in the form of commitment or suspended sentence accompanied by probation; the other a distinctly civil proceeding for the purpose of protecting the children.

Legal evidence was required, in the one case to establish the guilt or innocence of the accused; in the other to establish the status of the children. In both, the civil rights of the family in court are entitled to protection. The mother may not be convicted without due process of law, and the children are not to be removed from the custody of their natural parent except pursuant to a judgment founded upon competent evidence, establishing neglect on her part endangering their material or moral welfare.

In a flagrant case such as this, little difficulty is found in establishing the facts. The mother is adjudged guilty, the children adjudged neglected. The family is finally in court for whatever treatment the law authorizes the court to extend.

Reference must be made to the statutes governing the situation to ascertain the court's powers, yet they carry but slight indication at best of the social services available under the court's direction for the rehabilitation of the family. "Probation officers when requested by the court shall fully investigate and report to the court in writing on the circumstances of the offense, criminal record and social history of a defendant, and in the case of a child in children's court, the circumstances responsible for the child's appearance in court and his social history." So reads the law in New York, and similar provisions are found in other jurisdictions.

Pursuant to that authority, the probation officer undertook the investigation, during which the mother was continued in custody, and the children were placed in private boarding homes maintained at public expense under the supervision of the Westchester County Department of Child Welfare.

This investigation disclosed an unhappy story of marital difficulties extending over a long period, which apparently had created discouragement, hopelessness and a longing for sympathetic companionship, resulting in a reckless disregard of consequences. It also revealed, however, something worth trying to preserve or revive, a deep feeling of love and loyalty on the part of the children towards the mother, which must have been based upon some of the finer qualities she possessed, submerged momentarily in her distress. The results of the investigation were submitted in writing, and were placed in the hands of the

psychiatrist for his use in the study of the mother which he was requested by the court to make.

The psychiatrist reported as follows:

Mrs. X is thirty-four years of age. She is an unclean, foul smelling woman who shows many evidences of neglect of her personal cleanliness including the condition of her teeth. It was almost unbearable to approach her because of the high body odor.

She has an unhealthy personality. She makes so many contradictory statements and has such a reaction of defense that one is led to believe that she is of an even lesser intelligence than that indicated by psychological tests. Really she is less amenable at this time to supervision than she would be if she were feeble-minded. There is an admixture of irritability because she is called upon to be examined and to discuss her case with truthfulness, and an air of guilt. At one time she showed a little emotional weeping, but it was largely the reaction of self-pity and anger at the whole situation rather than depression over the situation of her children. Mrs. X could probably shed her responsibility for the six children with very little emotion. She already has some plan in her mind to put the unborn baby out in a nursery in order that she may go to work. Her plan is to divorce her husband, and marry her present paramour, Mr. A. Then she will bring all six children to live with her. Of course she does not believe Mr. A will accept this plan and she does not expect to go through with it. If Mr. A would consider such a proposition, he surely would be ready to take care of his own child. This Mrs. X believes that he will not do as she talks of going out to work to support this child.

One cannot depend upon her story. There is nothing appealing or sincere about her. She acknowledges her own infidelity but justifies it on the basis of Mr. X's actions, though she will not flatly state that she knows him to be untrue to her. Most of her statements in accusation of Mr. X or in defense of herself were given with too much emotional effect. She would not calmly state that things are not true. She angrily justifies certain things and weakly denies others. Most of her attitude, however, is a sort of coverup.

We could not get at any depth of factual matters with her. She is confused about her age at marriage; she does not remember her work record very well. She has lost the birthdates of two or three children; everything is indefinite. She acknowledges some intoxication but insists that her husband made her drink as he wanted her to appear fast. Men approached her for immoral purposes but they were sent by her husband.

Recommendations: In the near future the woman will need maternity care. She needs to develop better sanitary standards, to take care of her mouth, her body.

This woman should be detained in some way so that she will not continue to bear children. She has given birth to seven in the last fourteen years. Apparently she is sexually overactive. She has a very shallow emotional reaction for those children. She probably is not sufficiently systematic and orderly in her personality to practice birth control if she knew how. It is believed that a marriage with Mr. A will be attended with failure; in two or three years there will be more children to care for. One would like to know the innate capacities of these children born to the X's. John and Mary should be examined to see if they are mentally normal. Presumably it will not be possible to prohibit this woman from marrying again but it should be done if possible. She is not a proper caretaker for the six children and should not have them until she is better stabilized and shows better habits of cleanliness and sanitation.

Application of the criminal law by commitment to a penitentiary could work only further harm in this case. The woman needed constructive help and encouragement, something to restore her lost morale, to revive her hope and to give her courage to start afresh. Meanwhile the children must be cared for. All the various social services available would have to be called into action on behalf of this family in court.

Accordingly, she was placed in an institution maintained by Sisters of her own faith for just such purpose. Here she had her baby. She remained under the kindly care of the Sisters for two years. The religious side of the treatment was of course predominant and brought her back in time to the acceptance of moral standards previously discarded. She was carefully instructed in all matters relating to prenatal and after care of her baby, and to the keeping of an orderly home.

While she was away the children were kept together in a permanent boarding home. What a story could be written of the daily efforts made to insure these children a fair start in life! Not only did they receive the benefit

of well-conducted home life, regular hours for sleep and meals, and guidance in personal habits, but the county gave them medical and dental treatment equal, if not superior, to that received by the average child. The children adjusted well in the boarding home, but were never entirely happy separated from the mother. That wonderful tie of love and loyalty which usually exists towards even the poorest mother is something worth preserving for no substitute can be found for it in a child's life.

At the end of two years the mother was recommended for discharge by the good Sisters and a new phase of the problem was presented to the court which again had to assume direct responsibility.

The place of the court in the general social structure is frequently discussed. Is it a purely judicial body or does it have the attributes of a social case working agency? My answer is that the court should be able to bring to the assistance of the family in court all the social services required in the treatment of the problem in hand. The manner in which that can be done necessarily varies with the extent to which the community maintains social agencies to do the work. It seems preferable to dissociate family social case work from the court as far as possible. But the probation staff should be composed of competent social workers who can be called upon if necessary. The work must not be left undone. It is the court's responsibility to see that this is done.

Fortunately, in this case there was in the community a case working agency able and willing to undertake the further supervision of the mother subject to the approval of the court as to general planning. The baby was placed in a boarding home and the agent secured a position for the mother in domestic service. Meanwhile the father had lost his job because of dishonesty, was said to be infatuated with another woman and finally disappeared,

leaving the family wholly dependent except for the mother's earnings.

Rehabilitation Completed

How worthwhile all this effort proved to be! One year after the mother's release, the oldest boy, John, became sixteen years of age, and immediately asked to be permitted to live with his mother. Even though he knew all the circumstances of the case his loyalty remained and he was confident he could be of help to his mother, so that between them they might finally get the family together again. At first during a trial period John and his mother resided with relatives, she making enough money to support them, and he continuing in school as he was obliged to do under the education law. Mrs. X began to plead for the return of her children. The time had arrived to take another step forward. Accordingly, with the aid of the Department of Public Welfare, a home was set up for three; the mother, John, and the baby. The mother gave up work and devoted her time to her own home, being supported by the public department.

In contrast to the conditions spoken of in the psychiatrist's report, Mrs. X during her period of rehabilitation had become a capable homemaker. There had come to the surface a deep love for her children. Whenever difficulties arose such as budgeting or other matters, requiring perhaps a little more intelligence than she possessed for their solution, John was brought into the conference with her and the social workers, and assumed a large part of the responsibility for the material welfare of the family. Gradually the other children were returned to their mother as she continued to demonstrate her ability to accept such responsibility. In time a larger home was found for her and furniture was supplied, so that the children as they grew up might feel that the home was

not one to be ashamed of. From this home the oldest daughter eventually married. It being difficult for boys in their teens to secure work because of the unemployment situation, John was placed on a work project by the National Youth Administration, patrolling the crossings for the safety of school children, at which he was able to earn \$19 a month, all of which was contributed to the upkeep of the home. The other children continued in school.

During all this long period, the court continued closely in touch with the case although the actual work of constantly advising and stimulating the mother was done by the various social workers. Finally it was felt that the mother had demonstrated the permanence of her reformation and that the family should become self-reliant. The court caused to be instituted the necessary application for a mother's allowance, based upon the fact that she was a woman without a husband and with six children to support. The law prescribes the amount which may be allowed in such cases, and there is a monthly cash income supplied.

Time and again in the long-continued supervision of a family group such as this, the question arises as to which agency should be entrusted with the work. At various points in this case the family was helped by the Humane Society, the children's court, the probation department, the county department of child welfare, the religious institution, the Family Service Society, the National Youth Administration, and the State Department of Social Welfare, each and all of whose services were essential in bringing about the rehabilitation of the family. Case committee conferences from time to time determined which agency should go forward with the case, or the best method in which all could cooperate in the interest of the family. In these conferences the court was directly represented either by the supervisor of case work or by a member of the probation staff.

The time seemed to have arrived in the career of the X family when a change of supervision was advisable. The logical step seemed to be to remove them from the group of neglected children, and remove the mother from all remaining taint of delinquency, placing them completely under the supervision of the department supervising dependent children on the theory that they were at that point merely a dependent family, sufficiently trustworthy and dependable to manage their own affairs with such assistance.

Thus, though the case originally arose in that curious admixture of criminal and civil jurisdiction which I referred to at the beginning of this paper, it will be observed that the methods followed by the court were those of the social case working agency. The court stood at the head of a great organization, and was able to call to the aid of this family, through the application in the first instance of the criminal law because of the mother's delinquency, the many constructive services the community had to offer for the benefit of the family in distress.

The Function of the Court

One of the most interesting studies that could be made of the development of juvenile courts in this country is this very subject of the manner in which those courts have been able to take the cold letter of the statutes, and to build up and incorporate into them an unwritten law of social service based on human understanding. Nothing found in the words of the statute could give any inkling of the nature or breadth of the services required, involving social understanding, imagination, breadth of vision, kindness on the part of all those connected with the case, together with patience and persistence in seeing it through to a successful conclusion. Instances such as this might be

multiplied but would still give a most inadequate picture of the services which the children's courts are rendering society today.

Experienced social welfare workers sometimes criticize these courts because they have not become the effective instruments for the prevention of delinquency which their founders hoped they might prove to be. The work of the courts in the minds of these critics might better be entrusted to some agency such as the schools. These well-intentioned objections must be founded upon a lack of close contact with the truly socialized children's court at work. I am aware that a great many courts do not actually exercise their full powers, either because those in charge lack appreciation of the great opportunities presented to them for service, or because the social services essential to the broad functions which I have outlined are not available to them. Mrs. X, for instance, might have been committed to a woman's reformatory, and the children might have been placed in various institutions. The court might have washed its hands of the whole matter at that point, instead of maintaining contact and constantly endeavoring to bring about through every social resource of the community the rehabilitation of the family. Where, however, the court can see the possibilities of the situation, and where the community provides the facilities to work with, great results can be accomplished because the court possesses the power to make its orders effective.

When Mrs. X was first brought before the court she was not in the mood to listen to the advice of any well-intentioned social worker or any superintendent of schools, or anyone except a court which had the power of the state behind it to enforce its decrees. In fact, she was not in a frame of mind to listen even to the court. It was the power of the court to control her which was the starting point of her rehabilitation.

It is essential that such power be preserved. The necessity for court care of the family is usually based upon the delinquency of one or more members. Yet every effort should be made through our judges, probation staffs and social agencies, and through coordination of the work of all these institutions and a better understanding among them of their aims, purposes, and individual functions, to relegate to the background the legal side of the work, and to direct efforts towards building up a better system of social service for those in distress, at the background or foundation of which stands the juvenile court with the power it derives from the state.

In discharging these functions, the court operates not only as a correctional agency but as a great preventive agency. Experience tells us that the delinquent child is usually the product of neglect and that it is he who generally becomes that antisocial person we call the criminal. There can be little doubt in the mind of anyone that if the children of Mrs. X had been allowed to continue as they were when first brought into court, they might well have followed that road. Thus, when a court steps into a family situation of this kind, rescues the children and gives them opportunities for normal childhood and development into stable members of society, a truly preventive work of great value is performed. Moreover, its value to the community is not to be measured simply by the fact that these children themselves have been built into reliable citizens. We must bear in mind that they, too, will become fathers and mothers in the course of time, and those who have dealt with this problem over the years know that the child who is allowed to grow up as a neglected or delinquent child, upon marrying will very seldom make a satisfactory parent.

Too much in the prevention of delinquency should not be expected of juvenile courts which operate under definite

statutes and are limited and circumscribed by the terms of those statutes.

In the State of New York, for instance, such courts are limited to the correction, protection, guardianship, and disposition of delinquent, neglected and dependent minors. They were not created to carry on community programs for the prevention of delinquency. In our state, and I believe most others, the court is limited to dealing with children who have actually become delinquent, neglected or dependent, and has nothing whatever to do with children who are verging upon delinquency, neglect or dependency. A sworn petition must be filed alleging facts, and evidence must be adduced sufficient to prove the status of the child as a condition precedent to assuming jurisdiction.

Consequently the hands of these courts are tied to a great degree by the very statutes under which they operate, and if they have not become the great agencies for prevention which it was hoped they might become, let the responsibility be placed where it belongs, not upon the courts themselves.

Perhaps it is not desirable that the courts should be vested with broader responsibility. I am inclined to believe that is so, and I am also very definitely of the opinion that such broad responsibility for prevention of delinquency should be accepted by communities to a much greater degree than it is at present, through a much more effective coordination of community effort than is found to exist today in most localities. Still, while the court has no official responsibility in that connection, the judge himself and his staff can wield a very wide influence for the encouragement and creation of proper agencies. This service is being given in no slight measure by many juvenile courts and directors of probation who have taken the initiative in setting up coordinating councils or similar organizations. Their purpose is to weld together into one

effective organization the various resources of the community which are striving to improve conditions and keep the family out of court. That is a high mission. Let us hope, however, that our children's courts and probation departments may become universally recognized for their constructive social measures, and that those who must needs call upon us may turn to us with confidence and with hope.

II TRAINING FOR WORK WITH DELINQUENTS



Qualifying Workers for the Correctional Field

PHILIP A. PARSONS

*Department of Sociology, and Director, Bureau of
Social Research and Service, University of
Oregon, Eugene*

THE destinies of social work as we conceive of it in America are inseparably bound up with the destinies of democracy. Until 1929 a great many students of modern social problems confidently believed that what we had come to call social work was the answer to our major social problems just as the institutions of democracy constituted the answer to problems of a political and an economic character. Social work, as it was broadly conceived, was the application of certain scientific techniques in the handling of problems involving individuals, groups, and conditions with a view to alleviating suffering, eliminating difficulties, and contributing to the sum total of human happiness. Since our earliest conceptions of what later came to be called social work consisted chiefly of charities and corrections, the latter continued to loom large in the social work picture after it was complicated by recreation, group work, health and psychiatric work. In consequence it is impractical to approach the present problems of correctional work without surveying the present condition of social work as a whole; and the plight into which social work has fallen since 1929 is incompre-

hensible without an understanding of the plight of democracy, of which social work was coming to be an indispensable tool.

As the nineteenth century drew to a close there was a widespread belief among the so-called enlightened nations that democracy was the final answer to the major problems of contemporary civilization. The few nations who persisted in believing that force rather than reason was the only effective tool of social control were whipped into submission in the World War, and it was thought that in a relatively short period of time popular institutions and constitutional government would encompass the earth. This supposed triumph of democracy gave a tremendous impetus to the growth and spread of social work, which was apparently winning its old war with traditional charity on the one hand, and forcing its techniques and professional standards with considerable rapidity into the fields of public welfare and governmental administration on the other. But while democracy and social work were preparing to take possession of the world the sinister forces were gathering which were to block their triumphal march and make even their future existence problematical. At present democracy is fighting for its life; and in those countries which have abandoned it either temporarily or permanently the techniques of scientific social work have been taken over bodily as aids to radical experiments and its traditions have been thrown to the winds along with religion and personal liberty. In America the collapse of our traditional economic and political institutions has brought about a corresponding collapse in what we had come to call professional social work, and out of the welter of conflicting forces in which American civilization is now wallowing, it is not yet clear just what may emerge. Certainly it will not be the form of social work of which we were so cocksure up to 1929 or even later.

The profound changes which are taking place in the field of welfare administration are understandable only in the light of events which led up to them and of certain political and economic changes. With the latter we shall deal very little in this paper. We shall, however, give a brief consideration to the development of what we came to call professional social work and the assumption of social workers as a group that it involved specific training similar to that of education, the law, and medicine. Significant of the changes which we shall have to consider is the fact that the very word "training" is in disrepute. You will note that on this program we were asked to consider "qualifying" workers for the correctional field. At Memphis, in 1926, we confidently presented a paper on "Training Probation Workers," in the firm belief that we knew exactly what we wanted probation workers to do and exactly how to train them. In November 1936, the writer published an article in the *Commonwealth Review* on "Social Work as a Profession, Past and Present," which indicates the distance that we have traveled in the welfare field in the ten years between these two papers. We shall quote the substance of both later in this paper. Meanwhile we shall consider briefly the rise of professional social work and of training; the reverses suffered by professional work during the depression; the ascendancy of administrative work and the eclipse of case work techniques; and the growing emphasis on research and administration in other fields. We shall finally attempt to place correctional work and make some suggestions regarding the processes by which workers may be qualified for effective service in the correctional field.

The Rise of Professional Social Work and Training

Until 1905 few if any persons had thought of training for social work as a profession. But by that date what

later came to be called social work had developed so rapidly that the recruiting of workers had become a problem with the more progressive social agencies and with the few outstanding persons who had pioneered in the field. The settlements, friendly visiting among the poor, visiting nursing, the beginnings of the recreation movement, and the rise of the juvenile courts had created a growing group of workers who, added to the workers in the traditional charities, had been developing a group consciousness as indicated by the national conferences of charities and corrections which had been held annually after 1872, and by their accumulating experience and increasing contacts along the borders of related fields. That consciousness was stimulated greatly also by the charity organization movement in which a rift was already appearing between the workers in the newer movements and those in the traditional charities.

With the rapid development of agencies and the increasing numbers of young workers flocking into the field, older workers developed a tendency to impart to the younger workers certain techniques which had developed out of experience and were passed on by something like an apprentice system, i.e., learning on the job. The process consisted of giving the younger ones the benefits of the experience of the older ones. In this they were true to the traditional ideals of education which has always consisted of teaching the young what the old think they ought to know. The move to supplement apprentice training by specialized training came with the experimental short summer session of the New York C.O.S. in 1904, a course in which the pioneer workers told both apprentices and novices in classes what they had formerly been giving them in connection with their work. The New York School of Philanthropy was established the following year and the movement for formal education of social workers was

under way. The use of the word philanthropy indicated the break with traditional charity which was quite definite by this time. But the word philanthropy itself was to suffer by the lingering implications of pity and sympathy, and the final break came when the New York school changed its name to the New York School of Social Work and the National Conference of Charities and Corrections was changed to the National Conference of Social Work.

Important in the development of the first decade of the present century was the rise of sociology and its rapid development from a few pioneering school departments, to 1910 when there was something akin to a sociology department in practically all of the larger universities and colleges in America. The development from the very start of both theoretical and practical courses in this very loosely organized curriculum brought to these departments the students interested in social problems and concerned with becoming workers in this relatively new and fascinating field. It was from the graduates of these departments that the increasing numbers of social agencies recruited their workers before the specialized schools became numerous enough to supply the demand.

Naturally enough, the sociology departments in the universities and colleges situated in the larger cities began utilizing local social work agencies to give their students the benefit of laboratory or field work experience along with their academic training. About 1912 a group of schools formed the Association of Urban Universities which appointed a committee headed by Professor Beard to make a study of the extent to which field work was being used in connection with college and university courses and the extent to which credit was being allowed for it toward a degree. The writer, then professor of sociology at Syracuse University, was a member of the committee. The report was later published and now re-

poses undisturbed in a limited number of university and college libraries. Indicative of the extent to which the social workers of the period were recruited from the sociology departments is the fact that at Syracuse alone more than two hundred graduates who had taken major work in sociology entered the social work field between 1910 and 1920. A considerable number of other colleges and universities produced as many or more embryonic social workers during the same period.

The period from 1910 to 1920 is characterized by two significant developments. One was the growing conception of social work as a profession and the other was the rise in importance of the social work training schools. The former led to the organization of the American Association of Social Workers and the latter led to the organization of schools or divisions of social work in the larger state and private universities. Shortly after 1920 a group of the well-established schools organized the American Association of Schools of Professional Social Work and undertook to establish standards of training for themselves and for the profession. This latter development marks the definite recognition of social work as a profession and the establishment of standards of training comparable to those of law and medicine, although the multiplicity of fields which had been invaded by the social work techniques and to some extent the ill-fated field of sociology made it impossible for social work to orient a well-defined core of knowledge comparable to that imposed by law and medical science. As director of the Portland School of Social Work of the University of Oregon, the writer of this paper collaborated in the establishment of the Association of Schools of Professional Social Work and assisted in determining the minimum standards which have since been raised considerably. It was these standards that were embodied in the paper read at Memphis in

which the conceptions of training were adapted to the supposed needs of workers engaged in what was then called probation. This term survives in the name of the National Probation Association¹ in spite of the invasion of its field by psychiatric social work, child guidance, social work in the schools, child welfare work, and the development of social case work in the juvenile courts. After flirting around a little with all of these the National Probation Association appears to be verging in the direction of adult probation or parole—the terms are becoming almost indistinguishable—and it may yet profitably change its name to something like the National Association for the Correction of Antisocial Behavior. Until the present time, however, workers in this field have thought of themselves as social workers and their standards have been indistinguishable from those set up for the general field.

In summarizing this brief history of the development of social work as a profession and the attempt to determine the standards of training we should call attention to the fact that the techniques involved consisted in the main of case work including the investigation, interviews, records, plan, and followup involved in individual situations, and a measure of organization of community resources, including agencies and lay resources, i.e., people and money.

While these techniques were being developed the social workers must be given credit for a considerable merging of public and private philanthropic effort and the extension of their techniques to a great extent into the traditional field of charity on the one hand and into the field of public welfare on the other. The progress of social work also

1. The Association agrees that its name is inadequate for the scope of its activities and that in view of gradual developments in social work and present trends in the correctional field the name should be broadened. However, probation is hardly to be considered an obsolete term.

The Association has not to any degree lessened its concern with juvenile courts and their social work departments. Its activities in the field of adult probation and parole have greatly increased in recent years owing to a demand for service and assistance from many states newly awakened to the need of competent state assistance or administration.—EDITOR'S NOTE.

must be given credit for the rapid development of what we have called social legislation and the staffing of enforcement machinery with trained personnel. Unmistakably from this field the notions of efficient administration passed directly into the field of government where they are now meeting with signal success in given situations, particularly in local government.

*The Demoralization of Professional Social Work
in the Depression*

What happened to professional social work during the early years of the depression is too recent and too depressing to need much elaboration here. One of the first results was the increasing burden upon all of those agencies, both public and private, which operated in or adjacent to the relief field. Another result was the appreciable tightening up in the sources of revenue, both private and public. But in spite of this and its inevitable tendency to keep wages down, the first few years of the depression were boom times for the social workers in the family case work field because of the increasing amount of work to be done. In other fields, however, the results were devastating because of the tendency to reduce the support of agencies which were not immediately connected with relief in some manner. As the depression deepened and millions of Americans in all walks of life were precipitated into the ranks of beneficiaries of welfare work of one kind or another, private relief agencies shrank to a mere shadow of their former selves, collapsed altogether, or were merged into the colossal machinery set up by the Federal Government to administer the billions of dollars appropriated literally to shield the old and the new dependents from starvation and the related ills of complete or partial dependency.

At this point professional social work stood, like Moses

on the borders of the promised land, confronted with its coveted opportunity but prevented by a cruel fate from taking full advantage of it. Had there been ten times as many trained workers they could not have supplied the market created by the overwhelming need of relief, and opened up almost over night by numerous agencies of one sort or another designed to rehabilitate submerged classes and break the back of the depression. Into relief and these new fields were drafted all of the available workers who could be spared from other older fields of social work. To these were added men and women drafted from business, industry, and private life whose personality, education, or experience could in any way be considered to qualify them for the work in hand. Even these were not enough, and a large number of youthful college and university graduates were herded into the field, preferably from the social sciences but often with no other qualifications than youth, energy, courage and optimism, and a sufficient amount of intelligence to complete four years of college work. Efforts were made to herd these latter groups into short, intensive training classes, and to train them on the job to some extent by institutes and conferences; but professionally they were far, far removed from the elite who had won through to membership in the American Association of Social Workers.

At this juncture an astonishing thing happened. After a relatively short time on the job a great many of these untrained recruits were able to adapt themselves to the emergency situation and, unhampered by traditional standards, not infrequently they outshone and outdistanced numbers of the older workers qualified by both training and experience to function well under normal conditions. As a result, after the various pump priming activities began to improve economic conditions and the relief agencies were able to cut down their staffs of workers, not a few

of the newer recruits remained on the job while appreciable numbers of trained social workers found themselves looking for work of any kind. Within a year or two the new workers began showing up in large numbers at social work conferences and new stars began to glitter in the firmament at the National Conference; frictions not unlike the traditional ones between social workers and charity workers made their appearance between the drinkers of the new wine and the custodians of the old bottles. The figure is no more mixed than is the condition which we are attempting to describe. There are indications now that the two groups are seeking for a common ground but there is reason to believe that when the new workers have found themselves and the old have finally squared themselves with the new conditions, the results will not be the professional social work we struggled to achieve nor its techniques those which we thought were the answer ten years ago.

The Ascendancy of Administration and the Eclipse of Case Work Techniques

It may be that the decline in prestige of professional social work would have occurred eventually and that the process was only speeded up by the conditions brought about by the depression. The revolt against the increasingly rigid standards of the professional schools might have been expected as important groups of workers became less and less concerned with case work techniques and more and more concerned with research and the building of programs involving organization and administration based upon demonstrated facts. There were unmistakable evidences of a movement in this direction before the depression precipitated the present crisis. This was indicated in the organization of the Chicago School of Social Service Administration and the establishment at

the university of the group of promotional agencies subsidized by the Rockefeller Foundation. Admitting also that the forces at work in the depression have been many and varied, we shall confine ourselves to a brief consideration of four important factors which we believe were largely responsible for bringing about the changes discussed above. These four factors were the drying up of private charity and the funds of local governmental units, the ascendancy of federal relief, the rise to prominence of various rehabilitation and fact-finding agencies, and the development of the social security program. These will suffice to give the picture of what has happened in the field once considered the special province of professional social work.

Recent reports of sources of revenue for relief issued by the fact-finding division of the Social Security Board demonstrate in a striking manner the almost complete disappearance of private relief. Along with private revenue have gone many of the old established agencies which led the fight for adequate case work and the raising of social work standards. Several weeks ago the *Portland Oregonian* carried the story of the formal disbanding of the Public Welfare Bureau¹ after a continuous existence as a family case work society of over forty-five years. As was the case with so many similar agencies its machinery and staff were taken over about six years ago by the State Relief Committee and for the past two years it has not functioned as an independent agency. Recently its board of directors decided to wind up its affairs, distribute its accumulated resources among appropriate related agencies and formally terminate its existence. This event may be indicative of the passing of an era. It is doubtful if public relief-administering agencies will ever establish the institutional and individual contacts which it established, or

1. The name of this agency is misleading. It was supported by both private and public contributions.

impart to the public the ideals for which it fought so long and so successfully.

With the ascendancy of state and federal relief through the county welfare boards or committees, it is doubtful if we shall soon or ever see again the same intimate relation between the agency and its clients or the deep sense of social responsibility on the part of the taxpayers, which characterized the contributors of the private revenues of the old Welfare Bureau even long after it became the official relief-administering agency of Multnomah County. From the start state and federal relief found themselves obliged to operate with a minimum of case work, with a staggering overload per worker, and with resources so inadequate that the relief given was almost entirely material and so limited in amount that it bore only a remote resemblance to the family budget standards upon which the family case work agencies insisted before the depression. Under such conditions case work techniques found little opportunity for application.

As the formulators of federal policy found themselves getting away ever so slightly from the acute emergency situation, machinery was put in operation to lop off from the direct relief field all individuals and groups who could possibly be aided by some more constructive program. The development of the rehabilitation movements in the rural field and the final getting under way of the social security program removed large groups from the relief field with its case work techniques to fields where determinants were unmistakable, such as youth, age, and unemployment. Here the important consideration was administration rather than case work. It should be noted, also, that as case work becomes more and more limited by this process the possibilities of doing constructive work in its field grow less, and the task of giving relief to those who can be helped in no other way becomes one involving

a minimum of case work and a maximum of administration. Only in the child welfare field with its numerous ramifications does case work retain its former importance.

In the rehabilitation field and in the fields covered by the social security program, research and administration become the all-important factors. Research consists in getting the facts of a given situation, and administration consists in devising programs adapted to the facts and in carrying out these programs by whatever techniques the conditions may make practical. In the rehabilitation field and in the broadest application of the social security program, community organization will occupy a position of commanding importance. It is already developing techniques of its own.

The argument which we have attempted to advance in this paragraph may be roughly summed up in a single statement,—changing conditions, economic, political, and social, have shifted the major emphasis in remedial work from individuals and families to groups and conditions. Training for remedial work, therefore, must be built upon a base of research, organization, and administration rather than upon the case work which was the foundation of social work training in the past generation.

The New Emphasis on Administration in Other Fields

Time does not permit us to follow out all the implications involved in the foregoing conclusions. However, the change in the general field has been so great that the term "social work" is becoming, if it has not already become obsolete. What then becomes of the "professional social worker"? If we are right he or she must of necessity become something else, or, if continuing to merit that designation, find his or her activity limited to a relatively small field. In the latter case the present social worker must suffer deflation or reconcile himself to become some-

thing else. That the profession as a whole is suffering deflation no one will deny. There has been much discussion of causes, but, interesting as it would be to follow this theme, we cannot profitably do so here.

As we have stated, the trends have already been indicated. We are familiar with the terms *social service administration*, *public welfare administration*, and more recently *governmental administration*. We have stated, also, that the development of professional social work played an all-important role in bringing into existence the ideas embodied in these terms. Under its devoted tutelage the public is slowly learning that scientific and efficient administration of governmental machinery will make unnecessary most of what was formerly called social work. It will suffice for our purposes to mention several indications of progress in this direction.

Under the effective stimulation of the Spellman fund of the Rockefeller Foundation gratifying progress is being made in municipal research with a corresponding improvement in municipal government. This now shows signs of spreading to town and county government. We may even hope it will spread to state government. Already, under the influence of the American Public Welfare Association state administration of public welfare is making rapid strides in the direction of efficiency. In spite of what seem to be insurmountable difficulties, a considerable part of the federal administration's program for combatting the depression is working irresistibly in the direction of efficient administration in many different branches of government. As this general movement in the direction of efficient governmental administration grows, the social work profession must gladly reconcile itself to the necessity of assuming an increasingly unimportant role in the social scheme.

It is a significant fact that the discussion of training for

public service developed almost entirely outside the sphere of influence of the schools of professional social work. We shall not attempt to trace that development here. An excellent summary of the literature in this field will be found in an article in the *Commonwealth Review*, May-July number, 1936, on "Recent Trends in Public Service Training," by Herman Kehrli and Warren C. Hyde. While beginnings appear as far back as 1911, the first important university experiment came with the establishment of the Maxwell School at Syracuse. By 1935 some thirty-five universities and colleges had public service educational programs under way or were surveying the needs and their own facilities. The consensus of opinion among leading American universities is briefly this, that training for the public service cannot be organized specifically in a separate curriculum, either undergraduate or graduate. An excellent statement of general policy appears in the report of the University of Minnesota Committee, issued in 1935. We quote:

1. *It is not desirable to establish any formal or separate division within the university specifically charged with training for the public service.* The need at present is to make available to those students who desire to enter the public service such vocational advice and guidance as may seem necessary, and is consistent with sound educational policies locally determined. There is also the need to adapt educational procedures to meet whatever educational and experiential qualifications may be established by the governments for entrance into particular career positions.
2. There should be a standing all-university committee, representing as far as possible all schools and colleges concerned and the several social science departments, to be concerned with the educational and vocational guidance policies for public service training, to centralize certain information, and to render assistance to the colleges in coordinating their programs.
3. There should be assembled and made available for the information of all students and the faculty the curricular opportunities of all colleges relating to public service training.

4. Close relations should be maintained with civil service commissions and other appointing or recruiting agencies of government in order to obtain information regarding government requirements for training and to exchange experience with government agencies upon the educational and other phases of training.

At a conference held at Princeton in the same year a similar pronouncement was formulated. The following is from the report of the Princeton Conference, edited by Maurice Lambie and issued by the Public Administration Service, Chicago:

The conference is unable to find any single formula which warrants the establishment of an isolated university or college program which alone will emphasize preparation exclusively for the public service. . . . The conference recognizes that the importance of and demand for a trained personnel in the public service manifests itself as an influence within the normal and regular activities of educational institutions and calls for certain adjustments or emphases which may lead students to a better understanding of the duties and obligations of public service callings.

The undergraduate aspects seem to require no particular attention to the problem of preparation specifically for the public service except for the general concepts of training for citizenship. . . .

The conference feels that inasmuch as problems of preparation for the public service concern the whole university and touch upon so many phases of educational policy, anything less than a university-wide approach to the problems would be unsatisfactory. To this end it reiterates its recommendation that the problem is beyond the confines of any single department or special institute or school, and that the adjustments and adaptations, particularly in the early stages of transition of emphasis, may well be made from the all-university approach, particularly upon questions of general policy, coordination of programs and courses, flexibility of arrangements to cut across departments and schools, the collection of information regarding careers and public personnel data, and vocational guidance.

Summarizing the situation as it appears to be shaping itself in American universities, training in its broader

aspects consists of three general divisions, namely, undergraduate, graduate, and what is called "in-service training." It is generally agreed that the undergraduate training should be broadly cultural with emphasis upon the social sciences and specialization in those which are likely to be most useful in the chosen field. Graduate training appears to have been most successful which has emphasized research techniques and intensive study of recent developments part of which is done in the field. If the graduate training is extended to two years at least a part of the second year is profitably employed in apprentice training in collaboration with sympathetic governmental agencies. This, of course, involves fellowships and scholarships, the sources of which do not concern us here. The in-service training consists in assistance given to the worker in developing the particular techniques required by the job insofar as they could not be determined in advance. The latter has almost unlimited possibilities but involves a considerable departure from traditional methods of campus instruction. It is here, however, that the most salutary results are being achieved.

Another characteristic of this new development is the predominance of men in the field. Since the writer stands at the close of a career rather than at its beginning, he may safely venture the opinion that social work has suffered from over-feminization, a fact which has prevented a great many men from entering it. This judgment is based upon long contact with students in general classroom work and in social work training, and upon long continued public contacts with private citizens, laymen's organizations, and public officials. For the present at least, we are convinced that salutary results may be expected from the predominance of men in the administrative field. But our neck is out and we shall not invite disaster by going further in this question.

Qualifying Workers for the Correctional Field

No doubt some of my hearers have been wondering what this somewhat rambling discussion has to do with qualifying workers for the correctional field. We have been trying to prepare you for the revolutionary statement that correctional work lies properly in the administrative field, and that qualifying the correctional worker may be done better by the methods suggested for the general field of public administration than by intensive classroom instruction and the effort to provide professional techniques in a training period as is now done in most of the schools of social work.

This of course involves something of a revolution in the correctional field, which revolution we believe is already under way. As events are now shaping themselves the correctional field might well be limited to work with older boys and with men. Probation work, we believe, has suffered in the past by too close an identification with the children's courts and with psychiatric clinics and child guidance. These, together with social work in the schools, health work, and child welfare might well be delegated to the preventive field. We believe that correctional work can make a better case for itself with the public and do a better job by limiting itself to the correction of antisocial behavior and exerting its energies primarily in the field of rehabilitating convicted persons in connection with a scientific system of penology. And this we reiterate is primarily an administrative job and also primarily a job for men. The development in the branches of social work mentioned above and the establishment of more adequate welfare work in the counties make it no longer necessary for a correctional agency to operate in the juvenile field.

Having delivered ourselves of these pronouncements we may now turn to the consideration of how best to

qualify candidates for correctional work. This part of our paper, while all-important, need not be long.

Once upon a time we should have advocated extreme care in the selection of candidates for training. Under this new plan they are selected by a process of elimination and we do some selecting from a relatively small group of survivors. In a broad general program of undergraduate preparation for public service the student may have no clear-cut idea of the particular type of work he may eventually engage in, but he must elect some sort of social science orientation and your eventual candidate will probably come from a group of men who have manifested an interest in social pathology and leaned in the direction of criminology. These courses are included almost everywhere in sociology departments which require related courses in psychology, economics, and political science. Before graduating from college the prospective candidate will take a rather exacting course in methods of social research including an elementary course in statistics. His elective courses should be of a broad cultural character conducive to a lively interest in human affairs outside his chosen professional field once it has been selected.

The candidate who has come through the four years of college and who has decided upon some phase of public service as a career, should, in order to be successful, have more than an academic interest in his fellowmen. A generation ago we should have said he must have a firm belief in the Kingdom of God, but now, unfortunately perhaps, a majority of the candidates would not know what that term means. Let us compromise on his having a genuine interest in his fellowmen, a general belief in their redemptive qualities, and a desire to use his own talents and make his living in some socially constructive way. In other words, to use an old if not obsolete phrase, he must love men and believe in them. Otherwise he

should choose some career other than correctional work. The correctional worker must inspire confidence in men, and this he cannot do unless he believes in men.

Let us assume now that we have a group of candidates who have the qualifications and the courses suggested. What is the next step? Indispensable, we believe, is at least one year, if not two, of graduate work, in which the association with instructors and the mulling around over information and viewpoints are as important as any formal instruction. But during this period the candidate must have been thoroughly grounded in the processes of collecting facts and of weighing or evaluating them. During this period a maturing process is going on which is independent of any formal discipline. In his readings and his research the candidate is orienting himself in the field of criminology and penology. He should also, during this period, be familiarizing himself with operations in his field and be getting acquainted with men who are actually engaged in the daily job of dealing with criminals. Nothing commands respect and toleration so much as watching conscientious men grinding the daily grist, no matter how badly they may be doing it. If his graduate work lasts two years the candidate might well be farmed out to some agency to observe and to help competent men with their work. These processes appear to accomplish results faster than a corresponding time spent in the traditional academic pursuits. The reading and study which go along with the process are more carefully and intelligently done. The candidate finds out some of the things which he needs to know and proceeds to learn them.

The course of procedure suggested here may be expected to turn out a high percentage of successful workers, but it involves two things which are indispensable but not yet fully in the educational picture; that is, we cannot count upon them without some adaptation of the

traditional processes. First is the necessity of scholarships or fellowships to make possible the leisurely graduate process of ripening or maturing the candidate. Second is a satisfactory working arrangement with the proper authorities, including a sympathetic understanding on the part of judges, court officials, probation and parole workers and prison officials who must cooperate in the plan.

The graduate period with the proper relationship with cooperating agencies should all but guarantee positions for a limited number of candidates. These positions might in some communities be in the nature of apprenticeships either on part or full pay. This plan has the advantage of educating officials if the worker is installed on a demonstration basis, and of giving the educational institution the opportunity to continue its services in in-service training, the benefits of which would accrue to other workers in the field who may or may not have had the advantages of previous specialized education. In populous areas where numbers of in-service workers could be brought together occasionally for short conferences and where they could have the benefit of continued assistance and supervision from the educational institution, the techniques required by the job could be acquired and possibly improved during this third stage of the qualifying process.

Needless to say, the correctional worker qualified for this process would assist in bringing to the state a more adequate system of correctional and penal work. While educating a small number of workers, the educational institution would have an opportunity to make the acquaintance of administrators, win their confidence and cooperation, and press for reforms which might not be obtainable otherwise.



Preparing for Probation Work

VICTOR C. PASSAGE

*Director Probation, Fairfield County Juvenile Court
Bridgeport, Connecticut*

IT IS axiomatic that without competent and adequately trained probation officers probation is little less than a gesture and a mighty poor one at that. We glibly speak of trained and educated probation officers, but let us ask ourselves what should constitute this training and education. How do we arrive at the finished product—an ideal probation officer?

Before going further with this subject let me say that, for the sake of continuity and clarity, I am dividing the subject of this paper, training for and on the job, into two general sections, what training an individual should have to become a good probation officer and how training should be continued after he has become one.

In the past I have many times been asked the question, "Where can I get specific training for a probation job?" and I have had to answer that there exists no special training for probation officers and you will have to satisfy yourself with a general social work background and then make the jump to a probation job and learn the work *on* the job. In those days probation was merely an unwanted stepchild of the schools of social work. Even as recently as ten years ago the schools of social work refused to recognize probation as a specialized field and those who were interested in training to become probation officers were considered slightly psychopathic and eccentric and, needless to say, extremely "low brow." Fortunately both for those interested in probation and for the general run

of social workers, the schools of social work have grudgingly revised their attitude and have at last begun to provide some measure of training for probation work.

A workman to do a good job needs good tools. This applies to the probation officer. If he does not have the background of a good general education with special education and training in probation and social work techniques he is seriously handicapped.

I believe that the prospective probation officer should have a well-rounded college education which contains a good share of science. Many persons would specify a large preponderance of the social sciences, such as sociology, psychology and education. However, I feel that a goodly share of the other sciences, such as physics, chemistry and biology along with a fair amount of the so-called social sciences and history constitute a better background. Following this general education at least a year in an accepted school of social work should be the minimum. Two years would be preferable. If a student is fortunate enough to get a working fellowship with a reputable social agency, so much the better. By that I mean working as a student in a social agency, receiving a small remuneration for this work, and studying in a school of social work part time. This arrangement, I am led to believe, is rather rare at the present time.

If the college graduate can afford to, he should by all means spend two years in a school of social work and graduate therefrom. His first year should be devoted to a general coverage of the field of social work, with his first practice work in a private case working agency, preferably a family agency. I cannot emphasize too much the value of family case work experience if only on a student basis. Fundamentally, probation is based on family case work and in order to have a true and thorough understanding of probation work one should have a broad

conception of family case work as a background, preferably through actual experience in working with such an agency.

The second year in the school of social work should be spent along specialized lines relating to probation, parole and institutional administration. The student's field work should be taken in a probation department having excellent standards; if such is not available, then in a reputable parole or institutional agency.

Learning by Experience

After the student has been graduated from the school of social work he is ready to start accumulating actual experience on the job. A probation department should be his first choice, his second choice a position in a good social work agency preferably in the family or child welfare field. He may have to await his opportunity to graduate to a probation job. By using the word "graduate" here, I mean to imply that a probation officer's job, if well done, is one of the most arduous and specialized in the whole field of social work. A probation officer must have an adequate grasp of all social work in his community because he should be the focal point in any community plan for the treatment of delinquency and the prevention of crime. The ideal probation officer should not only know probation techniques but should be versed in community organization, family case work, child welfare work and group work beside being a good practical psychologist and psychiatric social worker. Do not be overwhelmed. None of us really reach that ideal, but we like to think of it. Very few probation staffs are entirely composed of such material. A few years hence they may be, but on the whole today I think chief probation officers are fortunate to have even a few of these paragons of training and correlated education.

In addition a probation officer must be the right person for the job. Permit me to quote William J. Harper, director of the Westchester County (New York) probation department, when he stated, at the Eastern Probation Conference in Philadelphia, October, 1937:

"No one should be accepted for probation service unless he is sound in health, mentally mature, emotionally balanced and genuinely interested in his fellow man. He should have a deep reverence for life, respect for personality, an unbiased point of view, willingness to learn, tact, self-control and high moral purpose."

Let us discuss then the problem that faces every probation department and chief probation officer to a greater or lesser degree, "training on the job." I am not going to discuss the problem of those probation officers on a staff who do not want to improve themselves or are too self-sufficient or ignorant to learn. It is the direct responsibility of the chief probation officer and the appointing authority to weed them out and dispose of them as speedily as conditions permit. My concern is with those alert probation officers on the staff who may have anything from a grammar school education to a diploma from a school of social work as a background.

The answer to the problem of the probation officer of limited education is night school until he has attained at least the equivalent of a two year college education. Today in our larger centers of population, if he is determined he may even obtain a college education and beyond by going to school at night. Working in the daytime and going to school at night is a long hard grind, but it can be done with perseverance, and the reward in security and professional recognition, in my opinion, is worth the effort.

Those probation officers who have a good general education do well to take certain specified social work courses at those schools which have recognized the need for train-

ing on the job and are willing to offer such opportunity. In some large probation departments leave of absence with or without pay can be arranged so that a probation officer may take a full term of study at a school of social work. Most departments, however, are so small or so understaffed that such an arrangement is not possible.

Staff Meetings

General staff training is achieved through the medium of staff meetings, conferences and reading. In my opinion, staff meetings should have three definite functions. First there should be the staff meeting at which general problems of administration, policy and procedure are discussed, amplified and made clear to all probation officers. Then there should be the case conference staff meeting at which specific cases with specific problems are discussed by the probation officers. One probation officer can be responsible for the presentation of the case, and constructive discussion can be directed by the case supervisor, or in departments without such a worker, by the chief probation officer. Not least in importance are certain planned staff meetings at which outside speakers on related fields may present their fields of work, the program to be concluded by a period for discussion and questions. In organizing such staff meetings the chief probation officer must be guided by the needs of his staff, time available for such meetings, and pressure of work.

In reference to conferences, I consider it very important that probation officers be permitted to attend the probation conferences held each year in many states. Whenever possible, depending upon each department's budget, the department should bear the expense of attendance at such conferences. It will be money well spent. In some sections of the country regional conferences are held. Every department located in such a region should

allow a selected number of its officers to attend the conference, insisting that on their return the officers present a summary of the important papers read at the conference to the entire staff. Every probation department of any size should have one or more representatives in attendance at the National Probation Conference each year, the number depending upon the size of the department and the distance to the conference meeting place. Again a report to a staff meeting by those who attend such a conference should be made.

Reading

Finally something is needed which is frequently overlooked and often not kept up to date—a selected library of new books and current periodicals in the field of social work and probation. Every probation department should subscribe to current social work periodicals and make them available to all members of the staff. No probation department is too small to have at least a small library of new books on probation and social work. Great care should be exercised in choosing such a library because, as is true in all other professions, a great many books are published annually, some of which are good, some indifferent and many wholly without worth. It is very easy and unnecessarily expensive to just buy any book supposedly pertaining to social work. If a library is well chosen, it can be comparatively inexpensive and worth many times its cost in practical usefulness to the staff.

Probation departments as a whole are far from this ideal of training. The only way to remedy this situation and to raise the standards of training is for every department head to do his utmost to obtain the best probation personnel available, and to constantly exert himself to improve the education and training of his staff.



Training For and On the Job

JOSEPH P. MURPHY

*Chief Probation Officer, Essex County, Newark,
New Jersey*

THIS year we celebrate the sixtieth anniversary of the legal birth of probation in the State of Massachusetts. Since that time, many changes and much progress have been made in the administration of this rehabilitative agency. Dissatisfied as we frequently are at the rate of this progress, when we look back over six decades of growth we immediately realize that probation has kept pace with social progress in this nation.

Looking back from this perspective, we see two outstanding developments which have influenced the administration of probation and conditioned the policies of its administrators. First is the attitude of the public which has changed from hostility to gradual acceptance of both the principle and the place of probation in the administration of criminal justice. Today we hear criticism of its administrative weaknesses, of the character and quality of its personnel and the ineffectiveness of its methods, but we seldom hear, at least from any informed sources, any opposition or question as to its necessity or place in the field of crime control and prevention. Newspapers, magazines, responsible public officials, colleges, universities, schools of social work, institutional administrators, many law enforcement officials all recognize its potentialities and urge its extension and perfection as an aid in the development of a more intelligent and humane judicial and penal process.

Of course, there are exceptions to this general state-

ment. In some places we still find reluctance to authorize probation except for juvenile offenders, and we still have a negative and oppositionist press in a few localities. But this only emphasizes the remarkable advance we have made in public acceptance. If I am correct in this appraisal of the situation we have a great opportunity to capitalize on a huge reservoir of support and make probation reach more nearly its unlimited possibilities.

During the early years of growth probation was used primarily in the cases of children or adults charged with minor offenses. Emphasis was placed upon the necessity of saving such offenders from the stigma of short term imprisonment. Frequently the object was merely to collect fines. With a few exceptions the approach was emotional. Kind-hearted judges and a few militant social workers struggled to secure public support and legislative approval. Volunteer probation officers predominated. Police officers, sheriffs, court clerks, district attorneys, jail wardens, truant officers, superintendents and principals of schools, social workers, even superannuated political workers were appointed to serve in this capacity. All one needed in those early days, it seems, was to have a love of one's fellowmen and a need for income. To have failed in business or to have succeeded in producing votes in one's ward might also be assets. Many such officers are still serving the courts today and let it be said in justice to some of them that they have done and are still doing a good job. However, we are not satisfied with this arrangement and we look forward to the time when every court in every state in the country will be served by adequately educated, competently trained, permanently appointed, full time, salaried probation officers. Too many officers today are insecure in their tenure, dependent upon continuance of the administration in power, selected and dismissed at will by judges many of whom do not themselves

have an adequate understanding of the qualifications needed for this work. But advances have been made. According to the latest directory of the National Probation Association, more than 4900 probation officers, a great majority of whom are full time, salaried officials, are now serving our courts.

The second outstanding development in probation administration is its emergence into a recognized profession with definite reeducative and rehabilitative functions. To achieve professional status, however, probation administrators must assume the obligations which this responsibility creates. Like the members of other professions, we must formulate our standards and define our ethics. In other words, we must "pull ourselves up by our own bootstraps." Recognizing as we do the importance and complexity of our tasks, we at once admit the need for adequate preparation and training for those who enter this field. Good intentions and love of one's fellowmen are not sufficient prerequisites for making comprehensive social investigations and executing the constructive, rehabilitative programs which successful probation requires.

Probation actually is a new science dealing in human interrelationships. Probation deals with criminals. Criminals commit crimes. Crime is a maladjustment arising out of a conflict between an individual, his group and society generally. It is an expression of a set of habits which are themselves a reflection of character. Habit patterns are developed from one's experiences throughout life, particularly experiences of children in the adult world about them. To change those habits and to effect rehabilitation is not a simple task. It calls for knowledge, skill, understanding, patience and persistence. It involves the whole range of life activity. This is a task that cannot be accomplished through force, threats, retaliation. A tact-

ful approach, skilful and persuasive guidance are required. These things are not inherited, they must be acquired.

Playing the Game

Whenever I think in terms of preparation for probation administration I am reminded of my experiences years ago as a football player and coach. Fundamentally, the principles of training in any profession are the same. One must acquire knowledge and skill in each vocational process and integrate that knowledge and skill into a whole technique before one is able to do the complete task. Accordingly we see everywhere successful coaches taking comparatively green material and by teaching each process of football, turning out in a comparatively few weeks a well-integrated team which functions toward a common objective. While the training proceeds the player absorbs the traditions of his school or college. To each member of the squad is imparted the coach's conception of football. Progressively then, as the player is put through a conditioning process, he is taught how to fall on the ball, how to run, tackle, block, kick and pass, with all the intricate variations of technique and skill required in each maneuver. Later, when the fundamentals are mastered, team play is inaugurated. Each player is taught how to cooperate with his fellow players, how to meet and overcome opposition with them. Gradually plays are executed with definite assignments which oblige cooperation on a "split second" basis to deceive, outwit and overpower the opponents. Finally, the strategy of the game is taught, including the elements of zone play and all of the psychological tricks with which football is replete. Football is a hard, bruising game. It requires the utmost physical stamina, a competitive spirit and a real love for the game. But even with those essentials a player is helpless unless

he has acquired definite skills and techniques as well as a knowledge of the strategy and psychological factors which make for sound team play.

Probation presents similar requirements. Probation officers have a common objective—the reeducation and rehabilitation of persons adjudged guilty or convicted of delinquency or crime. This is a complex task. Even a brief analysis will show that it requires definite skills and differing methods of execution. The approach must be variable, subject to modification, sometimes with great rapidity. Obviously it is a cooperative venture requiring the collaboration of the probationer, his family, associates, and community agencies. Moreover, probation officers must be properly equipped in character and physical capacity. They should like people, have a friendly disposition and be persons of the highest integrity, animated by the loftiest ideals. Character as well as competence is essential in probation administration.

Let us look a bit further into some of the procedures involved in this task. One of the primary functions of the probation officer is to inform the court by means of social investigations. All of us are familiar with the content of those investigations, involving legal, social and personal history of the offender, his education, family life, neighborhood conditions, employment history, recreational habits and associates, religious training, the aggravating and mitigating circumstances of the offense, and the attitude of the complainant. Moreover, this inquiry includes a study of hereditary factors, physical condition, mentality, emotions, philosophy of life, character and conduct, manner and appearance, and other factors which may be of importance to the court. Only those who have attempted inquiries of this type, many times under adverse conditions, can fully appreciate the skill and resourcefulness required.

Probation officers have another task, that of controlling, guiding and rehabilitating probationers. Here they are called upon to make accurate personality diagnoses and plan comprehensively to improve the probationers' environment and economic life, to adjust delicate family problems, find employment, provide for necessary medical treatment and health assistance, determine recreational and social needs, stimulate spiritual and moral improvement. Activity of this character can only be carried on after a thorough understanding of the conditions through which habit patterns are developed, attitudes created and group loyalties and relationships formed. Delinquents and criminals are the products of their communities. Patterns of behavior can be changed only when community standards are modified, and when attitudes, loyalties and group relationships can be altered or re-created. The probation officer must know how to interview under a variety of conditions, how to gather and evaluate legal and social evidence, how to express himself clearly and succinctly in reports to the court, where to seek and how to use information.

Unless he knows how to analyze the occupational abilities, skill and aptitudes of his probationers and has a comprehensive knowledge of the industrial and economic conditions of the areas in which he serves, he will be unable to help a large majority of his clients. The successful probation officer knows the most important local industries, the types of persons employed therein, the kinds of work available, the prevailing conditions of labor, the moral hazards involved. Moreover, he usually has a good knowledge of workers' organizations and is on friendly terms with the leaders of such groups. It makes little difference whether he lives in a large urban community or a rural, agricultural locality; the require-

ments are the same, even though the types of occupation, character of employment and workers' organizations change.

Neighborhood life is the key to much successful probation adjustment. Here the probation officer should have a knowledge of housing conditions, rental standards, the proximity of certain areas to vice and gambling resorts and other establishments of questionable moral character, availability of play space, adequacy of educational facilities, attitudes, customs, habits, cultural and racial conflicts and other factors which affect conduct and influence behavior. Knowledge of this kind can only be acquired through an orderly process of training and the day-by-day experience of case work responsibilities.

Frequently probationers, through superstition, ignorance, lack of financial resources or other reason, fail to seek necessary medical care and by so doing aggravate the conditions which have united to produce their delinquent behavior. Therefore when deciding health needs and planning to secure necessary medical treatment and health assistance, probation officers should have information regarding public health laws, child protection laws, the location and capacity of various hospitals, clinics, sanatoria, dispensaries, health stations, the types of persons whom such institutions will accept, and the personalities in charge. Without this knowledge they cannot successfully plan to improve the health of their probationers and in failing to do this they may negative the whole plan of treatment.

Another activity which calls for knowledge and skill is in the field of spare time occupation. Probation officers must, in a sense, be spare time architects. They should have a working knowledge of the recreational resources of the community, both for children and adults. Where

children are involved this includes location of playgrounds, opening and closing hours of such areas, personalities in charge, character of program and the relationship of the schools to the playgrounds. Moreover, the programs of Boy and Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, and other secondary character developing agencies should be known and understood by probation officers. Finally, they must have a complete knowledge of the location and character of moving picture theaters, laws governing the operation of such places, character of pictures exhibited, the type of management of dancehalls, roller skating rinks and other amusement places operating commercially. Included in this category also are the public parks, their management and program of activities.

Shall we go a step or two further in this analysis? The most important readjustments which probation officers must attempt are perhaps in the field of intellectual and moral education of probationers. When probationers are in school this involves cooperation with school authorities, where curricula changes and modifications are frequently necessary. To study such needs probation officers must have some knowledge of child psychology, teaching methods, educational equipment and facilities, curriculum content, educational policies and other matters which affect the school life of children. If the probationer has left school, and the majority of them do so at an early age, the problem may be one of creating a desire to make up lost opportunity, to enter night school, take correspondence courses, or take advantage of some other cultural or technical resource.

When the situation calls for moral or ethical training, here again the probation officer needs certain abilities. Religion is a potent factor in the formation of character. The probationer must be brought into relationship with a

religious leader and exposed to spiritual influences so that he may be motivated in his conduct and behavior by spiritual ideals. Unless probation officers are themselves guided by similar ideals, unless they know the location of the various churches as well as the identity of the clergy in their communities, and unless they understand the principles and obligations of the different religions they cannot be effective in one of their most important tasks.

Finally, probation officers must acquire knowledge from another field if they are to satisfactorily discharge their responsibilities. All of us are subject to legal controls and inhibitions. Practically every phase of our lives is regulated from birth to death. Many laws have been enacted in our states to protect the handicapped and to assist and regulate the lives of those who need it. Probation officers, therefore, should have at least an elementary grasp of statutes in the following fields:

1. Public assistance
 - Eligibility for relief
 - Receiving relief under false pretenses
 - Support by relatives
 - Begging
 - Refusing to work
 - Bankruptcy for the poor, and other matters of similar character
 - Medical attention and hospitalization for the poor
 - Removal of indigent families
 - Burial of the poor
 - Assistance for the aged
 - Care of the blind
 - Rehabilitation of the physically handicapped
2. Veterans and their dependents
3. Laws relating to children
 - Age of majority
 - Child labor
 - Children's work and wages
 - Children's contracts
 - Working papers

- Children's courts
- Custody of children
- Guardianship of children
- Dependent, abandoned and neglected children
- Illegitimate children
- Delinquent children
- Mentally and physically handicapped children
- Compulsory education of children
- Support of children
- Support of parents by children
- Crimes against children
- Vaccination
- 4. Citizenship
- 5. Voting
- 6. Immigration, deportation and repatriation
- 7. Public health
- 8. Building and loans
- 9. Installment buying
- 10. Landlord and tenant and other similar relationships
- 11. Small loans
- 12. Pawnbrokers
- 13. Mortgages
- 14. Wills and laws of descent and distribution
- 15. Marriage and divorce
- 16. Public records
- 17. Public institutions
 - Almshouses
 - Correctional and penal institutions
 - Institutions for epileptics
 - Isolation hospitals
 - Institutions for the mentally diseased and defective
 - Tuberculosis sanatoria
 - Soldiers' and sailors' homes
- 18. Labor laws and all the conditions which affect the employment of both children and adults

Any experienced probation officer will vouch for the fact that on many occasions he is required to give advice or make decisions which involve some knowledge of these procedures. Now I do not for a minute seriously suggest that probation officers should have a complete and detailed knowledge of such matters nor that they should give legal advice, but they do become involved in situations and they must make decisions and initiate actions which involve the provisions of state and federal laws. Consequently they should inform themselves about these procedures either through their own initiative or by exposure to a course of training in the particular department to which they may be attached.

Technical Training

From all that I have outlined herein it is apparent that probation administration is a responsible and complex function. With large case loads both for investigation and supervision, probation officers must organize their time, develop and refine their techniques with the greatest possible care. That is why they should come to the task well prepared and in addition should have the advantage of a continuous educational program on the job.

Training for and on the job involves two phases of the same problem. Preparation for probation service has to do with personnel not yet appointed. Training on the job concerns those already appointed. In the comparatively few states where civil service is in effect the question of preparation for probation service is somewhat simplified, at least for departmental executives. Competitive examinations require of the applicants definite qualifications with respect to education, previous experience, personality, skill. Other localities without a regular civil service setup may hold selective examinations and

carry out to some extent the same procedures. However, in most communities, probation officers are still appointed without such requirements. Many of them are selected merely because they happen to be known to a judge or his friends who themselves have no real appreciation or understanding of the qualities needed.

Preparation for probation service was comparatively difficult to obtain until recent years. Thirty years ago only one or two professional schools of social work were in existence and practically no college or university offered this specialized education. During those early years, probation officers depended upon their own study and experience. With the growth of probation, however, the National Probation Association and individual probation officers have seen the need for training, and today several universities and schools of social work offer training courses in probation administration, and all offer basic training in case work.

Graduate schools provide in their courses an introduction to methods of case work, child welfare, medical and psychiatric social work and social statistics with supervised field work. Specialized courses and lectures dealing with crime and delinquency are offered including motivation and causation of crime, social work and the law, social treatment of offenders, historical development of criminology and penology, and an outline of the jurisdiction, function and methods of institutions dealing with other corrective problems. Graduate students from New York schools of social work have had supervised field work in the Essex County probation department during the past few years.

Education on the Job

With the training I have outlined, a newly appointed probation officer is well fitted to begin his duties. It would

be a mistake, however, to suppose that even with this preparation he has adequate training. Obviously, no preliminary course could furnish him with all the skills required. He must have the opportunity to get additional education on the job. When he is a member of a large urban department this is not a difficult matter, but in the small departments and through the agricultural states, probation officers must depend for such additional help upon their state universities, local schools and colleges, schools of social work, the National Probation Association. For a number of years we have hoped that some day the Association might develop a training plan of some sort, perhaps a correspondence course, through which many probation officers out of touch with educational institutions might be helped.

Probation officers in Essex County are selected after competitive examinations held under the auspices of the State Civil Service Commission. Appointments are made by county judges. Minimum prerequisites for these examinations in Essex County are:

1. Education equivalent to graduation from a college of recognized standing with major work in psychology, sociology and economics, and two years of social case work experience with a recognized social welfare agency; or
2. Graduation from a standard high school and completion of a standard two year course in a recognized school of social work, and one year of social case work experience with a recognized social welfare agency; or
3. Some other combination of education and social case work experience, satisfactory to the Civil Service Commission.

Supplementing this preparation, other knowledge and experience with respect to criminal law administration, social welfare administration, case work practice and certain

personality traits and ability are required for appointment.

From these qualifications we readily observe that probation officers come quite adequately prepared for their duties. Once appointed, however, they immediately participate in a training program which aims to perfect their knowledge and skill in the adjustment of human relations. Before probation officers are permitted to undertake any case work responsibilities, an analysis is made of their personalities and past experience. Thereafter, if it is consistent with the requirements of the department, they are assigned according to their peculiar abilities and inclinations. For at least three months after their entrance into the service they are not allowed to assume full responsibilities for the investigation and supervision of offenders but are assigned to work with officers who have demonstrated their ability to teach. Gradually they are entrusted with specific duties under supervision. Further supervision is given by the officer in charge of the particular division in which they serve. At the end of three months, a report is submitted evaluating the new officers' attitudes and progress, and on the basis of these reports permanent assignments are made.

While undergoing this training, the new officers also take part in such other phases of the in-service training program as divisional staff meetings, held weekly, and general staff meetings, held semimonthly. The divisional meetings are presided over by the case supervisor or officer in charge. Case work problems such as interviewing, reporting of probationers, home visiting, job finding, enforcement of court orders, violations of probationary conditions, record keeping, case writing, dictation practices, cooperative experiences with public and private agencies, and evaluation of case methods and results, comprise the program of these meetings. Questions of policy are re-

ferred to the chief probation officer for discussion at the departmental executives' meetings.

A much broader program is carried out in the general staff meetings. During the past ten years, a great many speakers from a number of organizations and agencies have participated in these programs—social work executives, institutional administrators, clergymen, educators, judges, psychiatrists, business men and others have discussed with us a variety of subjects. Always, during these meetings, an effort is made to stimulate the widest possible discussion from probation officers in order to make them articulate and develop greater insight into their problems. Frequently they are given reading assignments and later required to discuss what they have read or studied before the staff. On other occasions, typical cases have been analyzed and submitted to the officers for study and criticism in order to test their judgment, evaluate methods and results, and modify departmental policies whenever necessary.

Because case supervisors and other executives cannot always give enough attention to the study of individual case progress, case readers are employed who devote their whole time to a review, analysis and evaluation of case records. Weekly reports on such studies are used as a basis for discussion at divisional meetings, general staff meetings or meetings of departmental executives. Supplementing the staff meetings and case readers' reports, regular bulletins are issued, through which officers are kept informed regarding matters of educational interest which concern probation and related activities.

Finally, a library is maintained for the benefit of all members of the staff. Current publications are regularly added to the various books acquired. Both as a means of preparation for promotional examinations and to keep

abreast of developments in probation and social welfare administration, probation officers use these facilities quite extensively.

Another matter, which is not strictly a part of the educational program but which serves a similar purpose and has equal value, is the attendance of probation officers at conferences of social work, probation institutes, meetings of social workers, community council activities, and meetings of other organizations which are concerned with criminal law or social welfare administration. All of these occasions probation officers are not only encouraged but frequently assigned to attend.

For a number of years, until economic conditions made it no longer possible, probation officers who entered the service without adequate formal education were encouraged to enter courses in the metropolitan universities or schools of social work, for which they were granted an extra increase in salary for each semester completed. Twenty-one members of the department at one time were actually entered in and pursuing such courses.

Our whole plan and program has been conceived and carried out in the belief that probation is sound in principle, that it can be successfully administered provided probation officers are competent and animated by professional ideals and standards. We believe that probation has a mission which can be fulfilled if probation officers are fully conscious of the causative factors of crime and delinquency, thoroughly grounded in the principles of character development, and skilful in the art of mobilizing and manipulating community resources. What we are doing in our own county can be done, with modifications and adaptations, in every other community in the United States and must be done if probation is to justify its place in the administration of criminal justice.

III PSYCHIATRIC SERVICE



Understanding One Another

SAMUEL W. HARTWELL, M.D.

*Professor of Psychiatry, University of Buffalo Medical
School, Buffalo, New York*

FOR some time I have known two boys. They are now seventeen and eighteen years old. I knew them first when they were ten and eleven. These boys were among a group of lads who lived in the worst section of their city and on the narrowest street in that section. Their names were given to our child guidance clinic by probation officers as boys who they felt were surely headed for delinquent careers. All but two of the eighteen boys, whom we organized into a "clinic gang," had older brothers on probation or in the industrial school. We undertook early treatment of these lads as individuals and as a group.

The story of the entire gang and the outcome of our efforts with them is too long to tell. You may be sure that it has some unhappy endings. But not so with these two particular boys, for they were pals. When he was ten Dominic said, "Gosh, Doc, I'm never going back on Joe. His ma's been in the state hospital, and his dad's always telling him he is going to go crazy. But he ain't crazy, and I keep telling him so. If he does go crazy like his ma, I've promised him I'd take care of his dog till he gets out of the hospital. Don't worry about me. I'm going to keep out of trouble. Joe's too swell a guy to take a chance on going back on." And Joe said, "The reason me and Nick are good friends is 'cause he is a

regular guy. He can know anything about you and not tell anybody, and he's your friend no matter what he knows."

That was just it. These boys understood one another, and in that understanding they were able to help one another. In the end, when we tried to evaluate the factors that did help those of the gang who have made good and those who have not, we decided that if we, as a clinic group, had had any part in Dominic's and Joe's success, it was by helping them to help one another to a mutual understanding and loyalty.

When this subject was given me, I thought of Nick and Joe. I wonder if psychiatrists and probation officers are not like these two boys—I mean, like them because we both have a confusing world to live in and a tough job to do; like them too perhaps, because a lot of folks don't understand us and say we have crazy ideas, though they may fail to call *us* crazy; like them, finally, because we need one another, and we likewise should understand one another.

I should first like to call attention very briefly to a very important change or advance that is occurring in the clinical psychological and psychiatric fields. One may briefly state this by saying that psychology and psychiatry, as well as the social sciences, now generally accept as a working principle a thought crystallized in a line written by the poet Goethe many years ago, "*The outstanding characteristic of man is his individuality.*"

This was not original with Goethe. In fact, common unscientific people have always known it, and scientific ones, too, in their ordinary relations with people. The scientific psychologist who has observed and proved some law of psychic phenomena in the person of the banker with whom he trusts his money, does not act as though the principle he has established was scientific when the

tramp he meets asks for his pocketbook. The trouble is that all science is arbitrary, and the arbitrary scientist must, insofar as he interests himself in human behavior, be interested only in any individual as an example in which he may find "some character of the whole." And finding it, he disregards the individual as an individual. But nature has centered her concern in the complicated organization of life processes into amazing living creatures, each of which is different from every other one.

The attempts to understand or the art of understanding one's self or others may never be a science, since it never can become an exact science. But the chemists, astronomers and physicists are commencing to say that theirs are not exact sciences either. So perhaps there is hope for us. The vital fact is that, very rapidly, our modern psychologists, sociologists and psychiatrists are becoming human. They are interested in human phenomena, even though they cannot formulate their interest into laws and generalizations concerning which they are beginning to bravely think and about which they can do something. Insofar as we psychiatrists have done or can do that, we have a place with you in your difficult, confusing, and often discouraging tasks as probation officers.

As psychiatry gives up the theory that it is or can become an exact science, it is able to use its accumulated knowledge and experience in more practical ways. We, of course, then work best with the other social sciences which have preceded us in becoming practical. For example, we better appreciate the probation officer's thoughts and ideas, even though they are not established as scientifically proved.

The Sins of Psychiatry

A mutual understanding is always enhanced by mutual confessions and acceptances of one another's weaknesses

and mistakes. So let us begin with the psychiatrist and confess some of his sins of omission and commission, sins that will, if we do not repent and sin no more, stand between us in our attempts to understand one another and to work together.

The psychiatrist has in the past often been guilty of the fault that I have mentioned. He has tried to believe that his thoughts about people and their mental lives and personal adjustments would lead him to some scientific classifications and rules that would be fixed and applicable to everybody. He has largely failed to establish these scientific principles, and has sometimes hidden his failures with words, hidden them often more successfully from himself than from others. We have, to use our own vocabulary, symbolized, and felt we were explaining things when we were only naming them. We have projected onto you, as probation officers, and onto parents, teachers and others the failure we knew but could not accept as our own.

Another fault we as psychiatrists have that often stands in the way of our being of practical use to others working directly with children or adults, is that of being overimpressed with our own results. All psychiatrists have individual cases with mental or emotional tensions that, under treatment and analysis, make remarkable recoveries. Often this recovery revolutionizes the behavior of the patient. There is danger that the psychiatrist will come to feel that, could he do his job well enough in the case of every misbehaving child or delinquent adult, he could cure them all. The probation officer feels that our impressive successes are not frequent enough to warrant this belief on the psychiatrist's part, and he is right.

Another fault the psychiatrist has is not being practical enough to see that, even though he is right in thinking many criminals and delinquents should be regarded as

sick rather than delinquent, these sick and unhappy delinquents must, in our present social organization and because of the general lack of understanding on the part of the public, be made to suffer by being punished rather than treated. Insofar as the psychiatrist, aware of the need for the establishment of facilities to treat the man sick in his personality rather than punish him, and of the importance of the education of the public in such matters, fails to do his part in proving his contentions about treatment in lieu of punishment, or fails to be a participant in matters of public education in the fields of sociology and mental hygiene, he will be most surely blameworthy in the eyes of the probation officer. For the probation officers are, as a group, in the forefront of the battle for prison reforms and establishment of other types of institutions for treatment of delinquents and criminals.

It seems to me that one of the chief reasons why we are not of use to one another is that very frequently the probation officer does not actually understand what the psychiatrist says. The dictionary meaning of the words that the psychiatrist uses may or may not be known to the probation officer, but unless these psychological words and concepts are a part of the probation officer's understanding of a psychiatrist's report or statements, a barrier is built between them that creates misunderstandings and mutual rejections. I will speak in detail of this very soon.

The Sins of Probation Officers

First I wish to mention some of the sins of commission and omission the probation officer commits in his relation to the psychiatrist and the psychiatrist's ideas and theories. When many of the older probation officers were first asked to use the consultant service of a psychiatrist or to cooperatively treat a case with him, they were usually

being asked to do something with which they were not familiar or for which they did not feel themselves prepared. They may already have had a dislike for even thinking about mental disease. With all of us there is a tendency in such circumstances to question the usefulness of a new method of practice. It is the duty of the psychiatrist to help the probation officer understand the new approach. If the psychiatrist's failures to help with the probation problems referred to him occurred frequently in their early relations, probation officers sometimes became prejudiced against a psychiatrist and this prejudice extended to the psychiatric approach itself. What the psychiatrist is trying to do is real and valid. His present dry methods may merit much objection and criticism, but prejudice against his goal of understanding the deeper mental life of our probationers is never justified nor useful.

There are other probation officers' sins, but we psychiatrists find as we try to help people who have fallen short of perfection, that while it doesn't do much good for us to tell them about their sins, often it does much good for *them* to tell us about them. I guess I'd better not talk to you about such mistakes as believing because being hard boiled helps one man who is on probation for beating his wife that it will help all the others who beat their wives, or because being sympathetic helps the man who was hungry and stole food that sympathy will help all who steal. No, I'll not talk any more along this line but rather invite you to come to the psychiatrists when they are together and tell us where you have failed.

The thing that has stood between us most frequently is that we have, times without number, thought we were completely disagreeing when we were agreeing perfectly though we were speaking in different terms. Next in importance is the feeling, and this is the fault of both of us

though the psychiatrist doubtless was the instigator of it, that it must be either the probation officer or the psychiatrist, alone, who understood what to do and did it, when in truth neither could have completed anything without the help of the other.

Let us take Jimmie as an illustration. The probation officer brings thirteen year old Jimmie Brown to see the psychiatrist. Jimmie had stolen some things from his father and sold them. Now he has stolen some brass. He has used the money to buy candy, ice cream and cakes. Jimmie's parents say he has a good home and that they provide well for him. The psychiatrist wins Jimmie's confidence and learns that Jimmie has been worrying about his adolescent sex habits. He tells the doctor that he is worrying for fear his habits will make him weak. He says he is too grown up to believe in God. He used to believe in God and was afraid of Him. Now he says of course he doesn't worry about committing sins excepting the kind the policeman is interested in. The psychiatrist tells the probation officer, in terms of the oedipus complex, the general scientific law of the relation of stealing to repressed feelings of guilt about sex. He assures the probation officer that the talks he, the psychiatrist, has had with Jimmie will be all that is needed.

But Jimmie steals some more. The probation officer hesitates to take Jimmie back to the psychiatrist. He did not understand and cannot remember the words the psychiatrist used to describe the boy, so he hesitates to talk to the psychiatrist about him. And once the psychiatrist had shown some amusement at the probation officer's suggestion that perhaps Jimmie liked ice cream and candy unusually well. So Jimmie is hurriedly tried out in a foster home. From then on he goes straight, and six months later the probation officer reports about Jimmie to the psychiatrist.

In this situation there is apt to be a disagreement as to how Jimmie was helped, or if no disagreement, a decision on the part of both probation officer and psychiatrist that the other just doesn't understand boys.

The foster mother might have been very helpful to them both if given the opportunity to tell them why she thinks the boy had been a bad boy and is now a good one. As she confided to her neighbor, "Sure, Jimmie is all right. The trouble with him was he was scared, and he didn't have the things any boy wants. To steal made him feel big and important, and besides, it satisfied his appetite for sugar. Do you know that boy told me that his grandfather died of diabetes and that his mother never let him have anything sweet to eat? And Jimmie's father has scared him about playing with himself. Do you know Jimmie actually thought he was such a bad boy that way that it didn't make any difference what else he did? It's nothing to help a boy you can understand easy like you can Jimmie. He thought nobody cared for him."

You see, both the probation officer and the psychiatrist were right, and both were wrong in thinking that his explanation was the *only* one.

I have told you about Jimmie because he was the boy who caused a very good probation officer to work several years with a critical attitude towards psychiatrists, and a good psychiatrist to be contemptuous for a long time of "ever teaching probation officers anything." After all, we do have to teach you something if you are to use our thoughts and try out our theories. You have to teach us something if we are going to understand folks who are doing things other than sitting in a chair and talking to us.

Understanding Ourselves

But there is a part of our teaching, as I see it, about which you will perhaps not agree with me. I believe that

mental hygiene is something that must be accepted as valid for one's self if one is to apply its principles in his work with others. There are none of us who are perfectly adjusted to life. We all lack self-confidence in certain situations, we all have some tendency to be easily offended, or to be discouraged, or angry, or confused, or afraid; and we all have these things as a part of us without our knowing why. Sometimes without our knowing it we have these experiences. Our friends see things in all of us that we do not see, or seeing, do not appreciate the effect on our behavior. We, all of us, need to better understand ourselves. We need to know why we can help one probationer better than another.

A probation officer who tries to work with a psychiatrist without reading and studying the psychological and psychiatric principles of mental hygiene will never find the relation useful. Probation officers are seldom guilty of that. But I feel that if the probation officer is to apply any technique of mental hygiene with his probationers he should go one step further and try it out on himself. He must be able to evaluate his own behavior and attitudes in terms of his unconscious feelings and forgotten experiences. Mental hygiene, applied as a way of trying to help confused, discouraged, and delinquent people, is a living vital thing. Probation officers sometimes make the mistake of thinking it is just another routine to go through with in their day's work. It doesn't work that way. There are some things about the social psychiatrist and his approach to the problem of delinquency and crime that are very important and that judges and probation officers should understand.

The most important thing of all is for the probation officer to feel that, no matter how interested the psychiatrist may become in the things he may find in the mind and emotional life of the delinquent, and how well

he may understand what he finds, there are two other things that he does not forget. He may seem to forget them in his interest in his patient and his desire to help, or he may really forget them temporarily. If he does, the probation officer is the one who must help him remember. These two things are of more direct and immediate importance to the probation officer than are the psychiatrist's actual findings. They are these: first, explaining behavior in terms of conscious and unconscious mental equivalents never, in an adult, and only rarely in the case of a child, *in itself* brings a cure of the mental conflicts or causes any appreciable change in the behavior of the patient. In other words, psychiatric cures seldom occur from a neutral examination and elaboration of the case, but require time and rather long treatment. With adults always, and with children usually, there is no more reason to judge psychiatry and its part in the treatment of the delinquent by the results to the patient from one psychiatric examination, than there would be to judge antisyphilitic treatment by the effect on the patient of taking a blood sample.

Second, the mental conflicts and abnormalities of the probationer are, in *no* case, the *only* cause of his delinquency. The way his body functions, the physical drives he has, the amount of intelligence, the degree of motor activity, his physical diseases and handicaps are a part of him, and his environment in all its aspects is also a part of him. And this is his personality. An individual's personality can best be understood in terms of an action rather than a thing. One's personality is the way he responds either by deed, thought, or feeling to the stimuli of life.

It follows then, that in every case the delinquency has some of its cause in each of these—his mind, his body, his environment. And it follows also that in no case,

even after the most careful investigation by the probation officer, the physician, the social worker, the psychologist and the psychiatrist, can anyone be absolutely sure that enough of the cause rests in any one of these factors so that a cure will result if the probationer is treated as though only one thing was the matter with him.

Working Together

If, as we work together, we can only always remember this, we shall neither of us be unduly discouraged if our treatment seems to fail and another's to succeed. Nor, and this is more important, shall we be unduly proud of our own success, realizing that those others who may have treated another part of the patient's personality had something to do with his success.

Another thing that should always be remembered is that any form of treatment requires that the person who carries on the treatment becomes important in the situation. Human change comes largely from human contacts. The personalities of the probation officer and the psychiatrist are important as well as their plans and their methods. We, none of us, do anything quite the same way as others, and it is ideas and interpretations we learn from others that are more useful than methods and techniques. We may agree at once that this young man steals autos because of a sense of insecurity and failure. Later we may agree that he also has a profound sense of fear of which he is not aware. We should work together by finding out why he steals, and planning for his care and environment.

But when it comes to doing the most essential thing, that of bringing him security and self-expression *you* will do it your way with your personality, and *I* shall do it mine. We may get suggestions from one another but neither can tell the other how to do it. We must keep these facts

in mind and constantly think back to them if we are to work together constructively.

Reports

But we are getting into rather deep water. Let us talk about more concrete things. One of the most concrete things you and the psychiatrists have to think about is your reports to one another. Most of you have prepared family histories and reports of probationers for the psychiatrist. Most of you also have been told how to make out these reports. Most of you have a form to follow, and what headaches they often are!

My opinion is that psychiatrists who criticize probation officers' reports are often to blame for the history and reports they do not like. It is hard for a probation officer to give the psychiatrist the material really wanted if he doesn't know what the psychiatrist does with the information or what part of it is important and why. You can talk to us about that some day.

So let us talk about the psychiatrist's report to the court and to the probation officer. Such reports may be divided into three general groups: (1) those from a psychiatrist who is legalistic and judicial, translating all his psychiatric thinking into legal terms such as knowing right and wrong, sane or insane, etc., and recommending the best legal disposition; (2) reports that read as though the psychiatrist considered his ideas past the comprehension of probation officers or judges and so gives only psychiatric and psychological discussions, often couched in highly technical terms; (3) the kind that go into details of the entire psychiatric study. They are often obviously written (as I guess all of mine are) as though the psychiatrist was trying to use the report to educate some one in psychiatry or convert some one to the gospel of mental hygiene.

Now all of these have their good and bad points. I think it would be ideal if the probation officers could send their cases to various psychiatrists from whom they might receive the type of report they could best use in each particular case, or the type of report the judge on the bench could best use. For, strange as it may seem, psychiatrists are human and do tend, the same as your probationers do, to repeat their crimes.

Often the first is the best type of report from the judge's standpoint. If he has little time, or is not interested in preventive psychiatry, or will not read a longer report, it is the best. But it is usually poor consolation to the probation officer. The second is useful where institutional treatment is needed. Often an imposing array of long psychiatric terms will hasten hospital commitment of the offender.

Reports of the third type are amazingly long at times. They imply that the psychiatrist expects the impossible from probation officers and others.

Questions Raised

I should like to answer in my way some questions I have had probation officers ask. Why does the psychiatrist harp so much on parental attitudes? Even though the man is fifty years old the psychiatrist talks mostly about his childhood. This is because, in a very deep sense, the child is father of the man. Nothing that modern psychology has learned is more thoroughly established than this. If an individual is to remain both civilized and reasonably happy throughout his life, he must, as a child, go through a series, a sequence, of emotional experiences. The parents largely determine whether or not this will happen. If the child goes through them too rapidly or skips some, he will get in trouble with the policeman and

thus become your problem, or if he goes too slowly or goes back looking after some emotional stage he has passed through, he will get in trouble with himself and become the psychiatrist's problem.

The early patterns of emotional response usually founded in the individual's feelings towards his parents are, to a great degree, followed through life. The psychiatrist believes these feeling reactions to life's experiences become fixed and out of the individual's control because they are fortified by his unconscious mind, which again was formed largely by his relation to the parents. Understanding the parents or changing them in their attitudes is often the only way the barriers of fear, guilt, and confusion, hidden from the individual himself, may be broken. The psychiatrist believes he can, indirectly, know much of an individual's mental life, his unconscious drives and emotions, through knowing about these parental attitudes.

Why does the psychiatrist talk about the unconscious so much? Because he believes that every human act is in part determined by something that is not known to, or in the control of, the individual. We are only beginning to really understand about that part of an individual, but we know it largely determines his character and personality, and conditions his behavior. It protects us against the feeling of grief or failure when we remember losing loved ones or giving up some cherished wish or goal.

We have learned much about the way this part of each of us is formed, how it sometimes punishes us, how it sometimes demands behavior such as crime so strongly that nothing can stem the force of the demand, how it sometimes gets control and we become psychotic, and how it is often our best friend and our worst enemy at the same time.

Another word that in many psychiatric reports seems

to be very important and to have some remarkable meanings is sex. Why is the psychiatrist so interested in sex? Well, in the first place, it is an important part of nature's plan to reproduce the species.

Second, it does carry much of the meaning of life for many well-adjusted and happy people, and a poor or unusual sexual life seems to be clearly correlated with problem people in every field of human behavior.

On the control of the biological instincts, of which sex is the strongest, has been largely built up the civilization of the race. This control has been very useful (civilization could not have developed without it), but it is also dangerous. In general, the psychiatrist believes that, if the control is insufficient, the person is in danger of misbehaving while if it is too great, he is in danger of neurosis or mental disease. Now it is always obvious to probation officers, judges or others dealing with criminals and delinquents, that some people who are considered bad are sick, and some people who are considered sick are socially bad. If a psychiatrist is asked to say which is which, a knowledge of the individual's conscious and unconscious sex life is of greatest importance to him.

The most important of all the changes that occur in the child in his physical growth, the gradual development of his sex feelings, go hand in hand with the very necessary changes he must make in his emotional response to other people. If any one of these is interfered with they are all disturbed. The child or youth who does not have a normal physical and emotional growth in the realm of sex is very likely not to grow normally in his social relations, and if he does not, either you or I are going to have to worry about him and try to help him.

Why does a psychiatrist have to use such long words? The answer is that he does *not* have to. If parents, teachers, judges, and probation officers will help him avoid a

feeling of insecurity because his suggestions about treatment don't always work, and show him you are interested in his thinking even more than his results, he will commence to use shorter and shorter words so you can understand him. If mental hygiene has any validity or if the psychiatrist has any workable suggestions, his theories and suggestions both may be stated in simple language. Even psychiatrists like to be appreciated, you know.

A probation officer whom I know very well recently asked me the most useful service the psychiatrist can render courts and probation departments. It seems to me the most definite thing the psychiatrist can do, if given the opportunity to make a full study of the probationer, is making a prognosis. If we could only tell for sure which of the first offenders would be offenders only once if placed on probation, what a difference it would make in our crime bill. We can say with reasonable certainty that people with certain types of inner mental lives are much more likely to commit crime or develop mental disease than are those we speak of as having an integrated personality. The every day and the exceptional behavior of the integrated personality are largely motivated by mental equivalents that are in their conscious awareness or are well controlled by their conscious minds. Or differently stated, the unconscious pull is in the same direction as the conscious. This does not necessarily mean that he is a nice person to live with or a moral upright person, but he does have a capacity to change. His pulls may both be towards crime. Such a person is the criminal for whom punishment may work. For if he makes up his mind to go straight he will not have the stronger part of his mind working against his will power.

The psychiatrist should be able to make a diagnosis that truly describes a person if he has a carefully prepared family history and an opportunity to make a thor-

ough psychiatric examination. Such a diagnosis is of real use to the judge and probation officer in giving predictions as to the usefulness or hopelessness of treatment.

At the head of the list of bad types of personalities, from the standpoint of reform, stands the psychopathic personality. Next perhaps is the dull type (the psychiatrist will perhaps call it hypophrenic). Not all feeble-minded people are in this class, only those whose total personality is built around their feelings about being dull or about unhappy experiences that occurred (especially when they were children) because they were dull. After this large group comes the moody personality (the psychiatrist may call it cycloid), the individual who is made happy or unhappy too easily and whose feelings are all-important to him. Next, the truly neurotic personalities, those who, by their very nature, have much of their behavior and feelings controlled by the inner unknown part of their minds. The psychiatrist, when he speaks of those who are in mental conflict means that the individual is struggling against letting this unconscious get control of his personality. These are the people he is most interested in treating.

Many of these in the poorly integrated groups either withdraw mentally, blame the world and become insane (or psychotic), or they become antisocial and delinquent. Sometimes a personality is so sure to break that the psychiatrist will say the individual is insane (which term he would reserve for those legally committable) though not yet definitely psychotic.

In my opinion the most important thing the psychiatrist may give in his report to the court is this diagnosis of personality type with its expressed or implied prediction of the outcome of the case. For much as we, both probation officers and psychiatrists, are interested in treatment and believe in it, the treated person has more to do with

our results than does our treatment. This fact is what makes mental hygiene so vital in real crime prevention.

Prescribing Treatment

What is the psychiatrist trying to do when he treats patients, or what does he expect us to do when he suggests that we do psychotherapy? Sometimes he is suggesting changes in environment basing his advice on things in the mental life of the probationer which he will not, for some reason, try to alter. Sometimes the psychiatrist deals in treatment with what he thinks to be the patient's deep emotional needs, bringing out as best he can healthy feelings such as courage, self-expression, understanding, and love, into his present life without trying to attack the bad ones such as fear, discouragement, lonesomeness, and confusion, which have been burned into his inner or unconscious personality.

Sometimes the psychiatrist will try by frequent interviews to do something about these past things which are so complicating the life of the probationer that they must be erased or at least accepted and dealt with by the probationer himself if he is to make good.

This is the psychiatrist's job. However, a part of this deeper psychotherapy is usually in the nature of confession, and sometimes the probation officer is the one to whom confessions are made. The psychiatrist expects the probation officer to know something of how to handle the situation when it develops.

None of these things are easy. And it is not easy for us, approaching a delinquent man or woman, boy or girl, from such different angles as we do, to work together or to understand one another. But we're going places, as our boys from across the tracks say.



The Traveling Clinic

ALLAN EAST

*Supervisor, Psychiatric Social Work, University of Oregon
Medical School, Portland, Oregon*

THE children's court procedure of this country is grounded on the premise that an understanding and intelligent approach should be made in the solution of child behavior problems. This understanding and intelligent approach, it is believed, should mean that each young client receives the benefits of scientific study and treatment. Unless the court order is based upon an accurate diagnosis of the behavior problem and a logical plan of treatment for its solution, we cannot consider that it has justified the true purpose of a court order. As scientific knowledge has advanced from the founding of our first children's court to modern times, our understanding of child problems has grown very markedly and it is quite possible now to arrive at a reasonably correct diagnosis and to plan proper treatment. Many behavior problems which seemed mysterious and untreatable in 1899 seem understandable and treatable in 1938.

The Scientific Approach to Child Problems

Historically speaking the courts first looked to judges and volunteer probation workers for the understanding and intelligent approach. Later professional probation officers applying specialized knowledge and skills to the task of diagnosis and treatment were increasingly used. From the beginning these leading court workers were accustomed to enlist the aid of physicians so that the findings of medical knowledge could be applied to indi-

vidual case problems, and more recently medical aid has come to include the benefits of psychiatry, the field of medical practice dealing with behavior difficulties. When mental testing and educational testing came into being, these aids were available through professional psychologists. From its inception, therefore, our children's court procedure has been wisely grounded on a scientific approach and has benefited by every increase in human understanding.

The Clinic in Relation to the Court

All persons experienced in court work know how dependent upon arrangements and good administration is the realization of court ideals. In order to obtain the benefits of psychiatric knowledge many of our courts have gone to considerable pains and expense. Some courts feel free to ask a child's parents to engage a psychiatrist, when this is financially possible, and some courts now include a psychiatrist on the paid staff. Still others take advantage of services available for children through social agencies cooperating with the court.

Included in the typical community setup of social agencies, there is usually found an agency known as a child behavior or child guidance clinic. Judging from existing reports it would seem that the first child guidance clinics were created almost solely for solving delinquency problems, but as the total field of usefulness became more apparent clinic jurisdiction was expanded to include many other types of difficulties. When backed solidly by community-wide approval, today's courts usually regard the guidance agency as without peer in its application of psychiatry to case situations, and therefore a valuable vehicle for the realization of juvenile court ideals. In several places the community clinic is partly supported by court

funds by means of an outright grant, or the court provides for one or more of the case workers of the clinic.

The working unit for a properly financed clinic usually consists of a psychiatrist as director, a psychologist, a case work supervisor and two or three case workers. The clinic case workers are usually well trained and experienced, the cases well selected by a policy agreed upon by the staff, and in a very direct way the workers cooperate with and are answerable to their case supervisor and the psychiatrist. This administrative arrangement with respect to staff constitutes the complete clinic organization.

In working out a case-referral policy with the full staffed clinic the court sometimes asks the clinic to take complete responsibility for the study and treatment of a juvenile case, considering this course of action to be an ideal form of court disposition, as such. Some courts receive frequent help of this sort, what the clinic terms the "giving of full service." Would that all courts could obtain this kind of cooperation! However, not in all communities does the court have the privilege of dealing with a fully staffed clinic. Where the financing of the community clinic has been difficult the actual staff sometimes consists only of the psychiatrist, psychologist, and supervising case worker. In a situation of this kind the clinic case worker supervises the work of all the case workers of cooperating agencies who may bring children to the clinic. In other words, the workers of the referring agencies act as the clinic case workers. Since the workers of the referring agencies may not have complete qualifications for doing psychiatric case work and may have too large case loads, this arrangement is not considered wholly satisfactory. However, many communities following this plan believe it to be efficacious, and all believe that it has much merit from an educational point of view.

It should be stated that clinics do not always give full service to the courts and the courts do not always consider that full service is needed. They may render only diagnostic service and agency consultation service, the terms being suggestive of their limited meaning.

Procedure for Handling Cases

Regardless of the organization in effect, the clinic staff, in team work fashion, handles the case problem in more or less uniform sequence. After the case has been accepted the case worker prepares the patient's social history study, the psychologist the psychological study, and the pediatrician the medical study. On the day of the clinic session all reports on the studies are made available to the psychiatrist for his scrutiny. The psychiatrist, then, sees the child, his parents and possibly others interested, and he, of course, is responsible for making the diagnosis and instituting treatment.

Following the psychiatrist's contact, a case conference is usually held, attended by the case worker, case work supervisor and any others necessary to the treatment plan. In the conference, the responsibility for treatment is assigned. The treatment plan usually involves psychotherapeutic efforts directed toward the child and his parents, and what might be termed efforts to manipulate the child's environment and provide constructive satisfactions for him. Usually both the psychiatrist and case worker will agree on carrying out parts of the plan. The goal of treatment, naturally, is the elimination of the behavior problem and the return of the child to good emotional health.

The Traveling Clinic

The so-called traveling clinic, such as is operated in the State of Oregon by the University of Oregon Medi-

cal School, is of necessity organized to meet the situation existing in that state. The central clinic staff, so-called, consists of psychiatrists and a case work supervisor working out of the medical school. These individuals give psychiatric advice, offer supervision and hold periodic clinics in certain designated centers throughout the state. The psychological, medical, and case work services are mobilized in each of these centers and therefore are local. In each center the local juvenile court refers cases with the probation officer acting as clinic case worker, or the court sometimes refers the case with the request that another agency's worker assume responsibility. As might be imagined, the medical school is confronted with the task of using local case workers who are not all sufficiently trained to give complete satisfaction. Because of this feature particularly, the project is considered to be of a definitely experimental nature. The communities which are aware of the issues, however, show an encouraging desire to obtain good local assistance. Despite the difficulties involved, whether known or unknown to the centers, all want the project continued on the present basis. The centers realize that psychiatric diagnosis and advice are not usually made available to communities of their size and they have derived great educational value along mental hygiene lines from programs of lectures and case presentations conducted along with the clinic.

At the present time in this country, psychiatric aid for children's courts seems more in evidence than for adult courts, apparently because there are more resources for children which may be mobilized for an effective attack on personality maladjustments, and because it has long been recognized that children are in the formative stage and are therefore more readily accessible to treatment. There is a great need, however, for the penetration of psychiatry into the adult courts, particularly at the point at which

the court is called upon to sentence the offender. Especially in cases in which probation is possible, a comprehensive social and psychiatric treatment plan can be arranged, safeguarding society and yet meeting the needs of the individual.



Use of Psychiatry in Correctional Schools

O. H. CLOSE

*Superintendent, Preston School of Industry
Ione, California*

PSYCHIATRY has been slow to find its way into correctional schools. The service has been expensive. Correctional schools, which have a relatively small inmate population compared with the reformatories, prisons and state hospitals, have not ordinarily had budgets liberal enough to pay for the services of competent psychiatrists.

Superintendents of correctional schools, usually laymen, have frequently looked with doubt and skepticism on psychiatry as an asset in the treatment and training of juvenile delinquents.

Workers with qualifications and temperament for such work with delinquent children are comparatively few in number. There has been, however, a sound foundation laid in many institutions for mental hygiene and psychiatric work through efforts of well-trained psychologists and educators who have used much practical psychiatry. The time is now ripe for well-trained psychiatrists, experienced in dealing with the problems of childhood and adolescence, to enter the correctional school field. The day has passed when the superintendent of such a school and his staff feel that satisfactory results can be obtained without careful diagnosis and the aid of treatment by psychiatric service.

Boys received by institutions after all sorts of programs have been tried out without success are fully fifty per cent of them serious problems. A good example of

this type is the boy who a few weeks ago in a correctional school left his seat after a slight rebuff from a woman teacher, and much to her surprise attempted to seize her and take her keys. He claims he was motivated by the belief that society has continually wronged him. His disturbed state of thinking has developed over a period of years until now he is rated as a criminal type. The example of his father, a habitual criminal who is now serving time in San Quentin, seems to him to be more commendable than that of his mother and stepfather whose efforts in his behalf have irritated him. Psychiatric service is essential for boys of this type as well as for many less serious social behavior cases.

The characteristic that differentiates the institutional from the noninstitutional case more frequently than any other is temperamental insubordination. The child sent to a correctional school in the main goes there because, in addition to his behavior difficulties, he has exhausted the patience of the authorities, first in the home and the school, and then in the juvenile court and on probation. Finally he probably passed through some of those small institutions, public and private, which act as buffers between the correctional schools and the community, such as detention homes, parental schools, camps and local training schools.

With boys of this character as its problem for rehabilitation and training, a correctional school cannot be expected to demonstrate miracles. The type of youth described above will not ordinarily respond to group methods of treatment or to repressive types of discipline. The problem becomes complex and calls for experimentation, research, and individual efforts with each case if state schools are to effect "cures." "Cures" is perhaps the correct term to use as most cases of serious juvenile delinquency are due to mental maladjustment.

The idea of illness as a basis of delinquency and crime is not new. Belgium and the Scandinavian countries base their methods of imprisonment, probation and parole largely on the fundamental idea that the offender is mentally ill, either permanently or temporarily. Their institutions are looked upon more as hospital centers and less as penal institutions.

Dr. Daniel M. Lipshutz of the State Psychiatric Institute and Hospital, New York, states¹ that more cures might be secured through psychiatry in our penal and correctional institutions than we are now obtaining in our hospitals for the insane if only the same sympathetic and scientific approach was applied to the inmates of these institutions. Dr. Lipshutz contends that the criminal mind is a diseased mind, either organically or functionally. He insists that until this point of view is accepted, until states and communities provide for such cases with all the medical facilities at their command, misjudgment and ignorance will continue to pour out on every community a stream of diseased minds to kill and to plunder.

The Need of Understanding

It is little wonder that the press and the public speak critically and sometimes harshly about the work of institutions and parole. I am surprised, in this enlightened age, that the criticism is not more severe and that greater attention is not directed to our hit and miss methods and our unscientific attempts to deal with the offender. One of the reasons for so much apathy on the part of the public towards our efforts to rehabilitate delinquents or reduce their number is the still prevalent belief that little can be done about it. There still remains a belief on the part of the average citizen that criminal traits are in-

1. Lipshutz, Daniel M., "The Criminal as a Patient" (*Probation*, October 1937, p. 6).

herited and that there is, therefore, little hope for the offender. Any superintendent or warden will attest to the fact that most of the visitors to institutions feel there must be something about an inmate of a correctional institution decidedly different from the average person on the street. As a matter of fact the antisocial individual is not different in makeup from other individuals. He has the same reflex mechanisms, the same psychological reactions, and the same set of human emotions.

When it is more fully understood that delinquency is largely a product of environment and training, and that by a proper approach to the problem many cases can be successfully treated and others not susceptible to treatment may be singled out for permanent custodial care, then society will gladly pay for the best psychiatric, psychological, and educational treatment obtainable. Such care will be recognized as sound economy.

It has been my good fortune for several years at the Preston School of Industry, Ione, California, to have the part time assistance of Dr. Fred J. Conzelmann of the staff of the Stockton California State Hospital. He has conducted clinics and diagnosed special cases. It is to Dr. Conzelmann that I am indebted for many suggestions as to the practical value of psychiatry in the operation of a state correctional school program. He has had both wide court and institutional experience. It is his opinion that good psychiatric work cannot be done with cases pending before the court. A diagnosis under the stress of trial and court procedure is difficult. It is not possible to give a true picture of the mental condition at the time of court commitment. At this time the psychiatrist usually finds the individual irritable and negative in his attitude. There is apt to be a complete denial of guilt, evidences of anger and hate against trustworthy witnesses, and accusations against parents, probation officers, teachers, the court and

others involved in the case. It is natural that this should be true. Such an attitude is a common defense mechanism of offenders to protect themselves by falsification and concealing the truth. Psychiatry can render a service in the interests of the individual and society by a careful examination and consideration of the facts, aiding the court in its interpretation, but the real service of assisting in the individual's redemption is after commitment has been made and the offender is under the care of an institution. The psychiatrist will then, when the youth has no longer any reason to fear that truthful statements will be used against him, if he understands his work, be able to quietly get facts and an understanding of the case.

Within the Institution

The psychiatrist in an institution should, in addition to formal clinics and examinations, have office hours in the institution when he is accessible to inmates for consultation and conferences. The guidance and advice should be purely professional, and it will be accepted on the same basis as medical attention from the clinic or hospital if the psychiatrist has the confidence of the inmates.

It is the opinion of Dr. Conzelmann that most delinquency is due to faulty habit formation arising from various causes. Many obvious cases develop from serious illness in childhood. The child is allowed too much freedom and too many privileges because of his physical incapacity and consequent tenderness of the parents. Foster parents, due to an outpouring of sympathy for the orphan child, fail to properly discipline him. An only child in the family finds it easy to get his own way and takes advantage of his parents' ability to be generous with him. The child without a father may become unruly and wil-

ful. There is also the unstable home situation so frequently encountered in dealing with juvenile misbehavior problems, which prevents the child from building up a feeling of adequacy and accentuates his feelings of difference from the normal. These home situations, therefore, produce exaggerated antisocial strivings for recognition in order that the boy may keep his ego intact. Thus we have the beginnings, early in life, of faulty habits that may lead later to serious antisocial behavior.

It is the belief of Dr. Conzelmann, based on his experience, that not only could many boys and young men now finding their way to correctional institutions be redeemed through psychiatric treatment, but that an appreciable number of incipient psychoses would be discovered and cured by this service. The development of many cases of criminal insanity would be prevented.

The psychiatric clinics held at the Preston School of Industry by Dr. Conzelmann assisted by the clinical psychologist and school principal, were also attended by other members of the staff interested in individual cases under treatment. It soon was evident that the psychiatrist was not only helping with a few serious individual problems but was also imparting to the employees of the school a psychiatric point of view regarding cases of serious antisocial behavior. A marked improvement of the staff in dealing with problem types was soon manifested.

The psychiatrist in an institution not only has the opportunity to diagnose and treat, but may train lay members of the staff to adopt an intelligent and sympathetic approach to problems of the unfortunate youths under their supervision. A practical mental hygiene program in an institution can be directed by an able psychiatrist working with a trained superintendent as administrator.

Not all cases sent to correctional schools, even under

the most expert and scientific discipline and training, will respond. There will be individuals whose parole will mean almost certain failure. Obvious psychotic and defective cases can, where psychiatric advice is available, be paroled on a more scientific basis, or not paroled at all in some cases but placed under indefinite custody.

If we can set up training schools where treatment and experimental work of the highest scientific order are employed, these institutions will soon cease to be classed by newspapers and peace officers as training schools of crime. The courts and parents of children with behavior difficulties will look upon our programs as they now look upon the medical clinic and the hospital for the physically ill. The correctional school will then no longer be the symbol of failure and forlorn hope that it has been in the past, but will represent scientific procedure upon which effective, purposeful and intelligent treatment and training may be based.

Good psychiatric service is as essential to good results in a correctional school as it is in a hospital for the mentally ill.

IV PROBATION AND PAROLE IN RURAL AREAS



Rural Probation Work

MABEL E. WILKES

*Probation Officer, Juvenile Court
Bellingham, Washington*

DESPITE the value we place upon the open country with its natural recreational resources and the opportunities it offers for normal wholesome living, we find that social and health problems do exist in rural as well as urban areas, and that problems of juvenile delinquency are found among country children as well as among children crowded into cities.

The rural probation officer's job is different from that of the court worker in a large city because he is working in a different setting where there are fewer social agencies, hospitals and clinics available to help him do his job. Particularly if distances are great, he is often isolated from professional groups and activities which offer stimulation and new thinking, so that it may be easier for him, in comparison to the urban worker, to fall into a routine handling of his job.

Despite these differences the case work used should remain the same because fundamental human needs do not vary. The rural as well as the urban worker needs to understand the emotional factors underlying behavior and to know how to work with the child and his family in order that causes of undesirable behavior can be recognized and treated.

The rural county usually affords but one probation officer who handles both boys' and girls' cases. In some counties with sparse population there is no provision for probation service except through volunteers or services supplied through another agency. In the State of Washington the county probation officer is appointed by the judge of the superior court handling juvenile cases and must be a resident of the county. Often because he has lived for years in the community he is known intimately by the people with whom he works. Often the probation officer as well as the judge in a rural community may have previously known or heard about a family which comes into juvenile court so that it is more difficult to be objective. In truly rural areas people feel that it is natural for them to know the probation officer's personal history just as they know about each other. In a city the probation officer's private life may remain his own affair. Because of these factors, perhaps the most successful rural social work is done by the person who enjoys country living, who readily relates himself to people in the community, and who learns the county well enough to know what people, clubs and groups can be depended upon for help with certain children. It is also important that he take an active part in community affairs, so that both he and others have a sense of his belonging.

It is interesting to note how the organization of probation work in a rural county compares with that in a more densely populated area. Most often the work of a metropolitan juvenile court is divided into departments or divisions according to function with an investigation or complaints department, a family department, a supervision department for both boys and girls, and perhaps others. Specialization of services makes possible also the segregation of boys' and girls' cases, with men handling the

cases of older boys, and women workers assuming responsibility for girls and younger boys.

Contrast with this the situation in a rural county where the probation officer has responsibility for the entire program of probation service. Complaints usually come directly to him, although sometimes they are filed through the office of the prosecuting attorney before the probation officer has an opportunity to investigate. The probation officer investigates complaints previous to filing a petition, makes whatever case study is made previous to the court hearing, and after the hearing carries out the plan made for the child. Sometimes this involves taking the child to an institution, or supervising him in his own or a foster home. Supplementing these duties is the job of helping to interpret to the community the program of the juvenile court and making available facts about juvenile delinquency that will be of help in social planning.

Some authorities feel that there are real advantages in having one worker carry the case from the first investigation to its completion. Treatment can begin at an earlier time and the child is not confused by a transfer of workers. Another advantage is that the worker, having all phases of the program, is able to view the county as a unit, and is able to recognize within it certain areas of delinquency. Through knowledge of the individual cases he may learn the reason for this concentration of cases and thus provide information to help in preventive programs. From my experience it seems to me that the greatest handicap of the one man system is that the one worker must handle both boys' and girls' cases. If he has the time and skill sometimes he can partially overcome this handicap through the use of volunteers as big brothers or big sisters who work in cooperation with the court.

Rural Cases

The cases that go through the juvenile court in a rural county probably do not differ greatly from those coming to the attention of any juvenile court. Children in the open country are not so often associated with gangs, although in an outlying community a whole series of thefts or sex delinquencies may develop from the bad influence an older boy exerts over several others in that vicinity. If the probation staff is limited for reaching out into the county, cases which should be having the protection of the court are often neglected until a child has embarked on a delinquent career sufficiently startling to arouse the neighborhood to action.

In a rural county cases come to the attention of the juvenile court many times quite informally. As the probation officer goes about his business in the county he talks with school teachers or principals, neighbors or the family doctor about a child he has under care. Often at this time these people will mention other children who they believe need the help of the court. As they become more familiar with what can be done for these children, citizens are anxious to refer them earlier when their patterns of behavior are less fixed. In outlying areas served by a county nurse word is often sent by her from the school principal that there is a child whom he would like to talk about when the probation officer is next in the community. These people are not always willing to take responsibility for making formal complaint or testifying against a neighbor although they may definitely know of deplorable situations. Partly because of this attitude, and partly because of distance from the county seat, it is easier for a country child's misbehavior to be neglected in really serious offenses. By the time he reaches court his behavior may be so complex and involved that it is impossible to help him.

Recently a school principal, a country grocer and several neighbors were visited by a worker who was interested in a family which had settled in this small community. The family consisted of a father past middle age and four children ranging in age from eight to sixteen years. Since the death of the mother four years previously the father had moved the family about from one rural community to another. He had only half supported them, had kept them out of school until forced to send them for short periods of time, and had neglected and mistreated them. For a time the sixteen year old girl had been under treatment for a venereal condition in another county.

Each person visited seemed sincere in his interest in the children and told similar stories of the neglect and abuse he had observed. All voiced fears as to what might ultimately happen to the children. None, however, were willing to have their names attached to any information given, saying that they lived in a small community and they dreaded being brought into altercation of any kind. Fortunately interpretive work can be done in the community and this attitude will become more socialized as citizens become better acquainted with the function of the juvenile court.

A number of complaints come to the probation officer through the county sheriff's office and in small towns through the local police. If such officers are familiar with and have confidence in the functioning of the juvenile court they will turn cases over to the court promptly. Most probation officers have had the experience of getting a case after a police investigation in which really destructive work has been done. In one such case officers took a fifteen year old boy off a school bus to take him into town for questioning. The entire small community was in this way informed that something was wrong. The

complainant did further damage by inferring the nature of the boy's difficulty. A few socially minded people in the community questioned the procedure of the officers, others were merely curious. Because of the kind of investigation made, the possibility of working out a plan for this boy in his own community was destroyed. A socially minded police and sheriff's force can do much to promote constructive work with juveniles.

Rural Resources

There may still be rural juvenile courts in which hearings are far from private and little different from those of criminal prosecution. I believe, however, that steady progress is being made in the direction of a more socialized court willing to use what resources there are to help the children it serves. The lack of resources has in many places resulted in sending children to urban centers for care. Sometimes a county is handicapped by extreme poverty so that adequate funds are not available to provide minimum standards of care. Again the laws may in some way be inadequate as for example the statute that sets up a maximum rate for the care of wards in foster homes or institutions. Often this does not cover actual cost, and good types of care are closed to the child who may be very much in need of a specialized service. Some rural areas have been so handicapped for funds that they have made lump sum appropriations to certain institutions for the care of dependent or delinquent children. All wards needing care away from their own homes are then committed to such institutions without much thought as to whether or not they are equipped to provide for the different needs of the children involved.

In some states where there is provision for the licensing and inspecting of institutions by well-equipped state

departments this difficulty is lessened. If minimum standards such as adequate medical and educational facilities and case work services are required of institutions before licensing, the institutions in turn ask greater cooperation from the courts committing children. They demand more adequate case history information and assert their right to accept or reject children referred. Often they also require payment for the child on a per capita or case basis.

The lack of facilities in rural areas to care for dependent and delinquent children has been widely discussed. Certainly there are fewer specialized social agencies and clinics than in urban centers and in some counties the complete lack of resources is appalling. Few counties, however, are entirely devoid of resources if the staff of the juvenile court is interested in looking for and using what are available. If there are good social agencies in the county the probation officer saves time and duplicated effort by first clearing with those agencies. Most communities have lay organizations, such as the American Legion child welfare auxiliary, the Kiwanis Club and others that have a welfare function or could be interested in some phase of child protection. In small villages and towns these groups would be familiar with the child in need of assistance and it would be useless to try to conceal his identity. This need not be a disadvantage. Rural neighborliness, the feeling of solidarity that a small community has and its willingness to take responsibility for its own problem can be useful, if directed. Gradually the probation officer comes to know the people in the community who are merely curious and those who are capable of taking responsibility for really helping a child. Sometimes the rural community can be cruel toward a child who has violated some accepted code or convention. Instances have arisen where the neighborhood was so judg-

mental and condemning in attitude that it was impossible to adjust a child in his own community.

While there may be no organized recreational centers the country does have its substitutes. The school, the church, and the grange are most often the centers of social activity, and the pastor of the church or school teacher may often be helpful in getting the shy or backward child into these activities. 4H Club work offers an outlet interesting to many farm children and at the same time teaches them.

In some communities Works Progress Administration funds used for paid leadership for recreational projects have made possible supervised play where it would not otherwise exist. Through cooperation and mutual planning often these activities can be placed in areas where there is greatest need for wholesome play outlets.

Rural schools in states having a progressive state department of education are no longer "little red school houses." Consolidation in some areas has made possible better equipped plants and teaching personnel. In districts where consolidation has not been possible due to bad roads and weather conditions, standards set for teachers and school plants by the state department of education have resulted in better training for children.

A rural school teacher who has lived in the neighborhood most of her life often knows a great deal about the children in her room and can give helpful information and suggestions. She is often an invaluable ally in carrying out treatment plans and particularly in changing a community's attitude about the "bad boy in the neighborhood."

For slow moving children, particularly older ones, the rural school often offers the solution.

Betty, age fifteen, seemed subnormal. When given a psychometric examination by the consulting psychologist of the State Department of Social Security she was found to function on the level of a high grade moron. Her home life offered few advantages. She had a feeble-minded mother and a shiftless, notorious father. Her two older sisters had become delinquent at an early age and had been in the training school. Betty disliked school in the town where she had been attending and truanted at every opportunity. She was larger than the other children in the fourth grade room, and suffered severely from the competition.

A work home was found for Betty in a small outlying community. The foster mother, a former school teacher, has a warm, friendly nature and more than average understanding of the problem Betty faced. She lives just across from the two-room school house with its school population of around thirty-five. The foster home offers an opportunity for instruction in housekeeping activities in a more individual and helpful way than Betty would get in a vocational or trade school. The foster mother is patient and will not hold up standards which the girl cannot achieve.

In the rural school situation with its mixed grade and small pupil-teacher load Betty feels less conspicuous. The principal who teaches her has been given the findings and recommendations from Betty's psychological examination. He is interested in helping her and is adjusting her school work according to her ability.

Seldom are there facilities for the psychological examination of children. Some rural communities are indeed fortunate to have the services of a psychologist, psychiatrist, or a traveling child guidance clinic provided through some central state agency. Often such services are restricted to areas where there is a trained social work staff to carry out the recommendations of the clinic.

Health facilities are a problem to most probation officers in rural areas. While it is desirable to have a physical examination of each child coming into juvenile court, seldom does the juvenile court budget carry sufficient funds for this purpose, nor does the rural county have the public clinic and hospital facilities available in urban centers.

Recent social security legislation has given considerable impetus to the formation of public health units through-

out the country by making available federal funds for this purpose. In the State of Washington fifteen full time health units have been formed or are in the process of formation. In areas served by such health units at least tests for venereal diseases and sometimes routine physical examinations can be provided for juvenile court cases.

Additional resources have also been made possible through federal funds in the form of child welfare services in predominantly rural areas. This has meant that in some counties where there has been no provision for probation service, dependent and neglected children can be referred to the child welfare service workers. Case work for delinquent children, if the court so desires, is also available in some localities. In the State of Washington child welfare service workers have been provided in 29 of the 39 counties.

Few rural counties have developed adequate boarding or free home care. Through the child welfare workers a better job is being done in locating boarding home facilities. In some places such homes are being loaned to the juvenile court for the care of delinquent children so that there is less need to send children to urban centers. Some rural counties have no provision for the detention of juveniles outside of jails and common lockups. Often well selected boarding homes, near to the county seat, can be successfully used for detention.

With these old and new resources at hand, and with the growing interest in developing increased facilities for the care of children in outlying areas, rural probation work need not remain static but can become increasingly useful to the courts and the children they serve.



Probation on the Frontier

B. H. ROBINSON

*Secretary, Juvenile Court and Probation
Commission, Utah*

WE of the intermountain west retain some of the psychology of the pioneer. It is, perhaps, that our immediate ancestry is not far removed from that pioneer stock which trekked westward over the plains to found our mountain settlements.

Probation has carved out a niche for itself in the scheme of things and has become an accepted part of our metropolitan programs. It remains for us to relate probation to rural America. This is our frontier with a wide gap separating urban probation work from the practices in rural areas. For background I turn to my own state of Utah to sketch with swift strokes a picture of contrasts to the accepted community pattern of organization for probation.

In the heart of the intermountain and semi-arid west there has been set up a state sovereignty over some half million people. Widely scattered over nearly 85,000 square miles, this population is settled in small valleys between the mountains with small communities of a few hundred to a few thousand people. Approximately half this population is settled within or in the immediate vicinity of the only city which professes metropolitan dignity, Salt Lake City. My picture here is of a people attempting to maintain community life according to our best American traditions while scattered over an area considerably larger than the State of Illinois, and all with a taxable wealth of some half billion dollars, or less than

the worth of a single block in some of America's more pretentious business sections.

The implications of this contrast should be plain. If we exclude our largest metropolitan area because of its urban characteristics and discuss the situation in rural Utah, then the great majority of our settlements lack even the rudiments of community organization to provide us with tools for our work. The individual settlement lacks all semblance of organized leisure time programs. Education is confined to the traditional school program with more or less routine mass treatment of the children. In most of our school districts and in most of our counties provision even for making individual mental tests is lacking. Many communities are without the services of a physician. Some do not even have a registered nurse among their residents. There is missing from this picture of our rural settlement almost all semblance of resources for sound social work practice either for diagnosis or treatment. Few states can set out greater handicaps either in the way of geographic barriers or in the limitations of wealth upon which to draw for support. My illustrations then will be drawn from this picture of extreme difficulties.

It has been repeatedly emphasized that probation as a specialized application of social case work can succeed only as it can put to wise use the community resources available to deal with family, health, educational and social needs of our probationer. What then shall we say when we confront almost a total shortage of facilities for meeting those needs? Shall we say that our problem here is one of developing those resources? Perhaps so, when the size of the community and the scope of the problem will warrant. But our settlement here is a small affair without the financial strength to support even the private

practitioner much less a public program. Shall we permit the level of facilities to predetermine the level of our probation services? To acknowledge this is to confess the absence of value in our services to such areas.

It is folly to regard the settlement, the city, the town or the county as the unit of organization. Our highways are no respecters of geographic boundaries. Industry no longer recognizes boundaries. The telephone, the newspaper, the radio have dissipated small group interests. In most respects our community horizons have been expanded until they are now state, national and international.

Thus we must widen our horizon in probation. Our unit of administration must be sufficiently large to provide those facilities we require for sound probation practice, regardless of whether administration entails reaching out to the county or to the entire state.

We start by viewing the court as an agency discharging no function which can be as adequately and as satisfactorily discharged through some other channel. We accept the viewpoint that the court serving rural areas need not have within itself all the essentials for diagnosis and treatment but should find them in the community. This reduces our total court content to the minimum of essential organization for the handling of its judicial functions and for initiating the probation program.

With a half million people to serve, with a half billion in wealth to tax for its support, with 85,000 square miles to blanket, the unit of our administration in Utah has become the state. In some lines of social work we are still respecting the smaller community units but even here such units are to a large degree only localized branches of a larger state organization. In both the adult and juvenile fields the state has become for us the unit for probation.

Such a program emphasizes mobility for both the probation officer and the probationer. Where medical, psychological or psychiatric services are not afforded in the local area, there seems no valid reason why such services cannot be obtained by transporting the probationer to the site where the services can be obtained. The alternative is to provide a mobile unit to bring such services to the locality. We are finding application for both plans.

For example we have but a single place in the state where there is any public service approaching that of a psychiatric clinic. This is in our state training school for the feeble-minded. Our juvenile courts have made good use of volunteer service to transport the child to and from the institution, traversing distances greater in single cases than the entire distance across some states. We have traveling health and dental clinics which bring their facilities to the local settlement.

A realistic viewpoint enforces many a compromise with the ideal of probation practice. Indeed it has seemed to us at times that the academic standards stressed by our schools of social work and in the deliberations of the National Probation Association have been altogether idealistic. It has come as a rude shock for the student to emerge from his studies and be confronted with the very real limitations in rural communities. Those limitations in our experience have been overcome to the extent that we have been able to widen our administrative unit, and in this process of expansion many of the ideals of the work must be sacrificed. Today the standards for probation remain far ahead of anything we have been able to approach in our rural practice.

Our program in the juvenile court field has been one of experiment. Utah was among the first states to provide a skeletal framework of juvenile court organization and

among the very first to provide state control and state administration with separate and completely independent courts for handling children's cases. In 1905 we created local court commissions in cities, and two years later made the juvenile court movement statewide by establishing a state commission and providing it with authority to organize such courts. In 1909 this program was extended to provide a court organization to blanket the entire state, separate and completely independent of other courts.

Thus the state has been the community unit for probation almost since the inception of the movement. During the years which followed establishment of this plan almost every conceivable type of local administration was attempted. Starting first with the few metropolitan areas, the local unit for probation was soon enlarged to include the county and shortly thereafter extended to take in the district which embraced two, three, four or even five counties, but at all times under a form of state control. Today we preserve the district plan of organization for our juvenile courts and their probation work. That is, we group counties into areas over which a juvenile court presides, still with the state acting as the administrative head to create, finance and supervise the work. Throughout the period of our experiment in rural juvenile court work and probation there is apparent the general trend toward greater centralization, with fewer units of administration until today we do not have a single city unit. Even to the court serving our largest metropolitan section we have annexed three other counties altogether rural in organization.

These districts lack many of the essential resources for effective probation work. This deficiency is being partially overcome by reaching into other districts for specific services particularly in such matters as detention,

boarding care, child placement, hospitalization and also other specific aids to the diagnosis and understanding of the problem child.

Progress in raising the standards of our rural service has been slow. Within the period of my own association with the work has come the breakdown of the public impression that a probation officer is some sort of mongrel cross between an old woman and a policeman. The local probation officer of the juvenile court was looked upon at one time and was in fact little more than a juvenile police agent. The popular notion of treatment was entirely punitive and repressive. Today we still find the carry-over of that attitude in a survival of the tendency to regard antisocial conduct in terms of evil and good rather than in terms of sickness and health. More rarely are we finding such an attitude reflected in the conduct of public officers, and almost never is it now reflected in the attitude of our courts.

Case work practice is still lacking in many places. A good advance was made with in-service training of the staff where they could be reached through one of our higher educational institutions, and we organized special classes under extension divisions of those institutions. This has been somewhat of a palliative, and has not reached the core of the problem. We are, however, faced with a shortage of people trained for this service. For several years past we have struggled with reduced budgets and at the same time tried to recruit to that service better trained men and women. A weeding out process is still in progress and we can see considerable improvement in the quality and the quantity of our probation offering.

I look back upon the time only a few years ago when the only semblance of any social case work outside of a

few metropolitan sections was that being done through the juvenile court. With our unit of administration as large as it was this necessitated probation by remote control, that is, the court and its staff constituted the directing head to supervise a program but relied on volunteer agents of the small community for the more immediate supervision.

Today under the impetus of the relief program and the various phases of the social security setup we are witnessing the first application of case work practices to rural areas and even some degree of specialization in the child welfare field. Coincident with this development has come a tremendous expansion of facilities for dealing with family, health, educational and social needs.

We now see a reversal of the order. Our pioneer program in rural areas is no longer leading the field but has surrendered its place to the general welfare program which is reaching out for the predelinquent child and is providing the court with local aid for its wards on a plane far beyond anything the court has been able to afford previously.

The entrance of this new agency into our rural areas has brought about many points of contact and occasionally of conflict between probation and the case work carried out through the local welfare agency under the direction of the state welfare department. We have undertaken a solution of those points of conflict on a realistic basis. Our problem has been simplified by the fact that the court in our state has never been the medium for handling aid to dependent children.

Our division of responsibilities has resulted in our turning over to the county welfare department all problems of dependency and neglect. In such cases the court has stood by for the exercise of its judicial powers when

they were required but even when brought into the case it was the welfare agency to which the court referred back continued supervision of the family.

The court has retained in its own hands the problem of dealing with the delinquent, especially since the majority of such cases originate through the local police constabulary. Where the court lacks paid local probation service we have employed the services of the local child welfare worker as the immediate agent of the court to make social investigations and also to supervise the delinquent wards. Where there is a paid probation staff member our delinquency cases have been cleared with the welfare agency, and if the child or family is one known to the agency a case conference usually results in a working agreement as to various points of continued contact between the two.

We are becoming keenly aware of current discussion indicating the need for redefining probation, not so much in terms of case work under the authority of the court as in terms of its relationship with other case work agencies. On the one hand we hear the view that the court should continue the treatment of personality and behavior disorders under the authoritarian setting of probation. On the other hand we hear of the agitation for separation of the judicial function of the court from the treatment processes, the suggestion that the court confine its services to the exercise of its judicial powers when needed, and surrender the treatment processes to some other case work agency.

Almost totally absent from our picture to date has been any real specialization in the treatment of conduct disorders either through the offices of the court or the welfare agency. Our work has been spread too thinly with altogether too many limitations to make specialization possible. As we emerged from the police stage to the point

of treating some causative factors our efforts became absorbed in meeting general needs and doing a general case work job. With that job now assumed by the public welfare agency it seems to me our next point of attack can be the specialized services.

Certain it is that our rural probation program should take note of the facilities which the departments of welfare, health and employment are building. These should be the means to raise the level of rural probation beyond the stage of moralizing and of watchful waiting. Properly employed these should strip the court of many cases which can be handled as well through other means.

Our immediate objective, as I see it in rural probation, is toward the development of the broader community horizon previously discussed. Concretely I hope to see that specialization accomplished by extending the district plan of consolidating several counties into a single administrative unit. We now have seven courts blanketing the state and embracing twenty-nine counties. It may be possible to further reduce the number of such courts and at the same time build up stronger court units.

This program I believe to be in keeping with a sound long range plan. With a public welfare agency in each county as the local administrative unit of social work, deficiencies in community patterns are being quickly brought to light and means are being devised to meet those deficiencies. I picture those same agencies as the principal medium through which our cases will be recruited. We are already attempting in our more remote centers to have cases originating with the police constabularies cleared by the police themselves through the welfare agency. Such departments will then constitute bureaus of intake control which should clear our congested court calendars of cases not calling for the exercise of the judicial function nor the

specialized services of the probation officer in treatment of conduct disorders.

All such specialization will necessitate a higher degree of training than we have had available in this field. This in turn presents its problems but sufficient progress has been made in this direction in recent years to justify an optimistic view of the future. We have raised the standards for probation officers from no standard at all to a level where we now require college preparation with special emphasis on social work. I see no reason why our courts cannot continue to choose probation officers from men and women employed in the general case work field. Thanks to the close working relationship between the court organization and the state department of public welfare this selective process is already being put into operation. That department through the subsidy of the child welfare grants is offering professional training both in school and in service. It has demonstrated its willingness to cooperate. Along such lines are we hoping to meet the problems of probation on the frontier.



Statewide Coverage in Probation and Parole

ROBERT C. EDSON

*State Director of Probation and Parole
Jefferson City, Missouri*

HUMAN beings are fascinating and baffling. These human beings begin as simple units and develop into complex personalities. From a dependent babe the individual grows into a powerful human dynamo which may participate in wrecking society or in creating a new and better social world. This human dynamo develops individual patterns of behavior, most of them conforming with the ideals of a better society. However, when the powerful forces of inherent and acquired tendencies in the individual react to the forces of society the result may be a personality which is inadequate to cope with our complex society. When this happens the juvenile delinquent or ultimately the adult offender may result.

The human organism acts to satisfy its needs. The inadequate personality is driven to act by the stimulation of such needs regardless of the conformity of the overt act to the laws of man and society. Those of us in the field of probation and parole are too prone to underrate the needs and the reaction of the individual who lives in rural areas. It is true a large number of juvenile delinquents and adult offenders come from congested areas in metropolitan centers, but many of these same individuals have migrated from rural areas into our cities, because of the inadequacy of the rural environment to satisfy the needs of the inadequate personality. It therefore seems to me that the problem of probation and parole in rural areas is of the first magnitude.

It seems to be quite apparent today that the best way to develop statewide coverage in probation and parole is by administrative and financial participation of the state government. It seems obvious that if law enforcement and incarceration for offenders is a state function, the related fields of probation and parole should also be state functions. When the court has placed a defendant on probation does it not seem rather absurd for the state to say, "We have fulfilled our responsibility to this individual and to society; he has been apprehended, tried and found guilty, and now you, the local unit, must assume complete responsibility for him from now on." When the defendant is committed to a correctional institution he serves a portion of his sentence and is released on parole. Again the state may say, "We have finished with this subject; it is now the responsibility of the local unit of government to see that he goes his way and sins no more." The state lends its aid and participates in other fields whose primary objective is the betterment of society. Then why should it not participate in probation and parole?

I believe the following incident illustrates the advantages of state participation in probation and parole. I was present in a juvenile court in rural Missouri not so long ago. The judge was sitting on the bench; three boys sixteen years of age stood before the bar of justice (and I use the term "justice" advisedly). The prosecuting attorney, in all of his dignity, informed the court of the offense with which the boys were charged. In stern tones the court inquired, "Are you boys guilty or not guilty?" Either because of fear or ignorance the boys did not answer. The judge asked again, "Answer me. Did you break into this store?" The boys replied that they had, and then, with the bearing of a public philanthropist, the

judge proceeded to ask the boys if, given another chance, they could behave themselves and stay out of trouble. Being fairly intelligent boys and knowing the results if they answered negatively, all three of them nodded their heads in the affirmative. The judge mildly threatened incarceration in an institution if they did not behave themselves, and then proceeded to give them some very fine fatherly advice. The case having progressed thus far, the judge called for the parents of the boys who had been sitting in the back of the public courtroom witnessing the procedure. They came down and stood beside their boys. The judge admonished the parents concerning their duties and responsibilities. The mothers, with tears streaming down their faces, the fathers, looking very stern and serious, listened to the advice of the court. Yes, it was a very touching scene. The dramatic moment having arrived, the judge told the boys they could go with their parents back to their homes; that he was not going to send them away, but he was going to place them on probation, and that he wanted them to report back to him within six weeks so that he would know how they were getting along.

I am sure that I need not point out the fact that the court had received no information concerning the family background, the personal history, nor habits of any of these boys. No effort was made to determine why the offense had been committed. Furthermore, I am sure that you have observed that the court was returning these three boys into the same environment from which they had come without making any effort to give them adequate guidance and supervision to assist in making a satisfactory adjustment. I recall to your attention that at the present time juvenile court procedure in Missouri is under local control. There are five separate local officers in Missouri

authorized by law to serve as juvenile probation officers, namely the sheriff, prosecuting attorney, county superintendent of public welfare, a worker in the Child Welfare Services, or a duly appointed probation officer, and yet not one was serving that court. It truly seems that that which is everybody's business is nobody's business. That incident might have taken place in any one of many juvenile courts in the United States.

In Missouri the same situation existed for adult probation as long as it was under local control. However, when the state enters the field an entirely different picture is presented. An adult is brought before the court charged with a felony. After a plea of guilty from the defendant the court is prepared to dispose of the case. I say "prepared" because the judge has been in personal conference with this state probation and parole officer and the prosecuting attorney, discussing the presentence investigation which was made by the probation officer. In other words, the court now has the information to make an intelligent disposition of the case.

Let's have a look at this probation and parole officer whose salary is paid by the state, whose expenses are paid by the state, and whose administrative department is a regular department of the state. Undoubtedly, you may think, being from the politically cursed State of Missouri, he must have obtained his appointment through politics. But such is far from the truth. He is a man selected on a merit basis by competitive examination; he is a skilled social worker, trained and experienced in the technique of case work. Some have said, "You cannot select probation and parole officers in Missouri on a merit basis." Under local control, I believe that statement is true. With state control, that statement has proved to be false. In other words, because of state participation the staff of

adult probation and parole officers of the State of Missouri is trained and qualified to do the job. In addition, every court in the state, rural and urban, now has available the services of a state probation officer who makes presentence investigations for the court and who gives competent supervision to the probationer.

It has been interesting to observe the changing philosophy concerning the relationship between probation and parole. Combinations of the two services are not new, but some of you will recall the heated debate which took place in 1936 at the meeting of the National Probation Association in Atlantic City¹ over a resolution endorsing the extension of interest in parole by the Association, and the strong opposition to the passage of the resolution on the part of some. Two years later, in 1938, it is a recognized fact that probation services can be effectively combined with parole services and the interest of the Association in parole has grown correspondingly. Coming from a state where these two services have been combined under one separate state department, I find that in actual practice we have had no difficulty in having probation officers also serve as parole officers; in other words, in combining probation and parole services. In fact it has been distinctly advantageous both to probation and to parole.

I suppose no state in the Union has been more severely criticized for its malodorous parole system than Missouri. Time does not permit description of the revamped parole system, except to say that there is a single Board of Probation and Parole, appointed by the Governor, and paid by the state for their full time services. Whereas in the past the parole board could rely only upon letters of recommendation, pleas of friends, relatives, and poli-

1. *Yearbook*, 1936, National Probation Association, p. 392.

ticians in selection of parolees, now they have the staff to prepare case histories and pre-parole reports with adequate and verified information. Supervision of the parolee used to be recorded on one sheet of paper; the parolees now supervised are described in social case histories of standard type.

I can tell you only briefly how state coverage was secured in Missouri. Year after year interested agencies and individuals sought the passage of a bill permitting the state to set up a department of probation and parole. Year after year their efforts were doomed to failure. Discouraged but never admitting defeat, these groups became more determined and finally in 1937, victory was theirs because of the long years of education which they had promoted. It was theirs because some of the legislators became aware of the fact that crime in Missouri was too expensive; because other legislators were far-sighted enough to see the direct benefit of state coverage in probation and parole; because Missouri had a Governor who was interested in giving to his state an efficient administration.

Indirectly I have attempted to show that state-wide coverage in probation and parole is desirable, first, because it permits the establishment of uniform and state-wide standards in probation and parole; second, it permits the employment of skilled and qualified personnel; third, it is the means of improving the selection of parolees; fourth, it permits more efficient and economical administration of a probation and parole system; fifth, it makes possible investigation and supervision for the probationer and the parolee on an adequate basis; sixth, the state's participation in probation and parole provides probation service to every criminal court in the state.

The President of the United States, in his book "Look-

ing Forward," said of probation what is also true of parole, "It is a state's affair, and this whole matter of probation should be made the state's business and put under wise state control. I hope that in all states we shall continually decrease the number of prison guards and wardens and increase the number of our parole and probation officers."



Limitations of Rural Case Work for Delinquent Children

VERA H. McCORD

*Field Supervisor, State Department of Social Security
Washington*

THE juvenile court, since its inception, has been practically the only agency available in rural communities to take responsibility for controlling juvenile behavior problems. Many of the rural areas in Washington are still without any special court organization, and such services have been extremely limited because the law provides for a probation officer only in counties with a population of 20,000 or more. In the more sparsely populated counties of the state one judge is often assigned jurisdiction over one or more counties and is without probation or other social service.

Limited attention has been given to the problems of juvenile delinquency in rural areas. Recent studies, however, have shown that areas which at first sight appeared to have few or no problems, upon further study revealed situations which called for a more adequate development of community resources for dealing with antisocial problems.

An opportunity for further study and service in this field was furnished in 1935 by the passage of the Social Security Act which provided federal assistance to the states in making Child Welfare Services available in areas predominantly rural. The encouragement of adequate community child welfare organization was the avowed purpose of this section of the Act. In the State

of Washington the child welfare service program is administered by the division for children of the State Department of Social Security, and provides services for dependent, neglected, handicapped children and children in danger of becoming delinquent. Cooperation with all other community activities for the prevention of delinquency is stressed. The child welfare workers are part of the staff of the county welfare departments, working under the supervision of this division. Their work is definitely integrated with other functions of the county welfare department and the state department.

The program for dependent children providing assistance in their own homes opens up an opportunity to analyze the causes of dependency and its attendant problems. As the program developed in our state it was found that the problems of dependency were so closely interwoven with those of delinquency, neglect and domestic relations that in order to give intelligent consideration and assistance to dependent families it was necessary to consider all these social problems in their relation to each other.

The handling of juvenile problems has always been the function of the law-enforcing agencies and the counties have evolved different methods of meeting these problems. Where there is no probation officer the cases are handled by the sheriff, the prosecuting attorney or a court commissioner who, depending upon the seriousness of the case and his own understanding of the fundamental problems of children, may bring the child and his parents before the court. The child may be reprimanded, returned home, placed on probation or committed to a correctional institution or one for the care of dependent children. In most instances he is not seen again by the authorities until he is brought to their attention through some other antisocial behavior either on his part or that of his parents. The officials are frequently unable to pro-

vide the necessary followup care and supervision because of other duties.

Many of the cases brought to the attention of the court are recipients of public assistance. In order that intelligent disposition may be made of such cases, the law-enforcing agency and the welfare office should coordinate their activities in working out a plan of treatment and supervision for the family, because it is impossible to treat any one member without taking into consideration the family unit. At this point in Washington the child welfare workers, the court, and the law-enforcing agents began the development of a relationship that now appears to be yielding some constructive results.

Developing Relationships

In the development of a definite and recognized court relations program, two methods of approach have been used: (1) working from a particular case experience to a general community interpretation; (2) working from a general community interpretation back to case experience. In the development of either method no set procedure can be outlined. Success, however, depends upon mutual understanding and appreciation of the policies and philosophy of the respective programs. The county welfare organization should devote its attention to strengthening community organizations and establishing constructive social relationships in an attempt to fit the child welfare program into the community pattern.

The development of a program of service to the juvenile judges in one of the rural counties began when the child welfare worker became acquainted with the personnel of the various law-enforcing agencies, concerning himself with the methods used in disposition of juvenile cases and familiarizing himself with policies of organized community groups interested in a child welfare program.

There is no official probation officer in this particular county and the responsibility for investigating complaints, bringing the child into court and supervising the case devolves upon the prosecuting attorney and the sheriff. The judge, who has jurisdiction over two counties, is not always available, but delegates the responsibility for juvenile cases to the prosecuting attorney.

Since many of the cases coming to the attention of the court are known to the welfare office, the child welfare worker offered his services in securing information and carrying out any supervision that might be ordered by the court. The prosecutor's office was anxious to take advantage of this offer since both he and the sheriff were conscious of the need for such services and were dissatisfied with the attempts of a local self-appointed probation officer to fill the need.

The cases referred to up to the present time are of three types: domestic relations, involving custody of minor children; cases for institution care, both delinquency and mental deficiency; and probation.

The first child whom the prosecutor referred to the welfare office was Joe, a boy thirteen years old, alleged delinquent, about whom many members of the community had filed complaints demanding that he be committed to the state training school. A complete social history of the case revealed that the parents were separated, that the mother neglected the boy who reacted to his situation by persistent stealing and truancy. The prosecutor recommended that he be placed in the home of the maternal grandparents under supervision of the child welfare worker. Joe was reinstated in school. He was given some recognition through a definite assignment on the baseball team. He later became a member of the 4H Club. A few odd jobs on Saturday provided sufficient spending money. He no longer was the "town's worst boy." This case is more or less typical and illustrates the need of proper evaluation and use of all community resources in working out a coordinated program.

The following case, involving the custody of minor children, illustrates the type of family problem which is being referred by the judge of the superior court for a prehearing investigation. Mrs.

Sarah S., a middle-aged woman of substantial middle class breeding and training, engaged the services of a local attorney in an effort to gain custody of her five minor children whose care and supervision had been awarded to the paternal grandmother. The attorney, familiar with the child welfare program, requested the services of the welfare office in making a prehearing investigation. He believed the mother to be a suitable guardian but was concerned about the welfare of the children and had neither the time nor the facilities to make a thorough examination of the situation.

Accordingly the worker discussed the matter with Mrs. S. who recited a long story of abuse and neglect suffered at the hands of her husband. In other interviews with Mrs. S. it was learned that she had married when very young leaving the security of a well-to-do eastern family home life for a relatively rough western existence. Her husband had insisted upon rearing a large family even though her health would not permit it, and her mother-in-law continuously marred their married life by intrusion and fault finding. The culmination of fifteen years of marital difficulty, during which time Mrs. S. had five children and suffered three miscarriages, was her voluntary commitment to a mental hospital. According to the hospital report she was suffering from a neurosis caused by epilepsy and had a long history of nervous prostration followed by convulsions. Two years later she was released to her family as fully recovered but a continuance of the former life proved unbearable and her husband finally divorced her. The presiding judge had found Mrs. S. incapable of giving her children adequate care and had awarded their custody to the paternal grandmother.

Subsequent visits to the grandparents' home, talks with the father, grandparents and children, convinced the worker that the living conditions there were prejudicial to the children's best welfare. After interviewing former neighbors of Mrs. S. who testified to her good qualities as mother and housewife the worker submitted a report to the lawyer describing the present situation. Mrs. S. had so impressed worker and lawyer with her physical energy and mental alertness that the case was prepared for hearing without further delay. The services of a psychiatrist in an adjoining county were sought to examine Mrs. S. and advise as to her fitness to care for her children. However, the psychiatrist felt that the introduction of outside testimony would be looked upon as prejudicial by the local court, and he advised waiting until after the hearing before making his recommendations.

The presiding judge, who declared that his only interest was

the children's welfare, discussed the case with each witness. The question in the court's mind was whether Mrs. S. had the economic means to care for her children and whether she had completely recovered from her mental illness. Since there was doubt in his mind regarding the degree of the mother's mental stability, and since the father was steadily employed on work-relief while the mother had less favorable prospects of income, the court continued custody of the children with the grandparents but gave the mother permission to keep them during the summer vacation months.

The case of Mrs. S. brings to light certain advantages and disadvantages common to the development of a rural court relations program. An outstanding asset was the studied and conscientious care with which the case was prepared by the lawyer. He demonstrated his willingness as a professional person to seek as deeply and thoroughly as possible the underlying factors in any given case. Offsetting this advantage is the lack of employment and restricted rural opportunities during periods of economic stress which may seriously handicap one or both parties at a hearing involving the future care and support of children. Since every effort was made to prepare this case as thoroughly as possible before the hearing the absence of local specialists was a decided handicap. The lack of a qualified witness to testify as to the mother's mental stability was detrimental to the best interests of the children since disposition hinged in part on this very point.

It is an interesting fact that attorneys in this particular community, observing the services that have been given to the prosecuting attorney and sheriff in cases of their clients, have requested the same services themselves, particularly where custody of minor children is involved. In such instances where the worker has assisted in gathering facts relating to custody of children, the attorney has asked for an interpretation of the findings, and the final disposition was based upon interdiscussion of the entire

family situation. It might seem that the worker is "spreading services too thin" at this point but giving such assistance to lawyers proved a good method of interpreting an important service to the community and has brought about more intelligent planning for the children involved and a more equitable adjustment of marital difficulties.

The Subnormal Child

The second type of case referred to is the subnormal child who is brought before the court for possible commitment to an institution. Since January 1, 1938, when the child welfare program in this county began to function, three such cases have come to the attention of the local welfare department. In two of these cases the children presented decided behavior problems, so serious in fact that the community insisted that they be removed from their homes and institutionalized. The three cases were referred from the school department to the prosecuting attorney who asked that a prehearing investigation be made. Instead of a hearing in court with the usual meager testimony based on a layman's observation, a complete social history, psychological tests given in a nearby city, and a report on the child's physical condition were presented to the court before the hearing. Commitment to the custodial school was made based upon the reports, but due to overcrowded conditions, two of the children could not be admitted. They were returned home and placed under temporary supervision of the worker. Two definite results were accomplished here—the needs of the children were determined as accurately as possible and the court has adopted as part of its regular procedure the policy of securing adequate information before a commitment is ordered.

The case of Junior M. illustrates what may be accomplished by this service to the court. Junior, eleven years old, is in the

second grade at school. The teacher complained to the prosecuting attorney and the sheriff that he was stealing money and setting fires; that he was a disturbing element in school; that he was an incorrigible delinquent; and that he should be immediately committed to the custodial school. The prosecutor and the teacher asked the worker to make a careful study of the home situation with the object of working out some plan for supervision of him. There was considerable doubt as to Junior's having stolen the money or even his having a hand in setting any fires. Although his home environment left much to be desired, both of his parents were interested in his welfare. It was apparent, however, that he was slow in school and could not do second grade work. Psychological and psychiatric examinations were given which indicated that he was definitely subnormal. He was unable to compete with other children. Both the psychologist and the psychiatrist of the child guidance department of a nearby city to which he was taken for examination recommended immediate custodial care. The parents were aware of Junior's need for special training and realizing that they could not supply it agreed to petition the court to have him committed to the custodial school. Commitment was ordered, based upon the findings of the child welfare worker and the recommendations of the prosecuting attorney.

Although delinquency is not so prevalent in rural communities, treatment and supervision are just as necessary as in urban centers. Little preventive work is being done in most rural areas and practically no facilities exist for working out plans of treatment.

A study of delinquency in rural areas covering a period of six months, from January to June 1936, reveals an unbelievably small number of reported cases. This study shows the need of a more complete reporting system covering all phases of the child's contact with the court. In a majority of counties record keeping is at a minimum with very little attempt to make use of recorded information in the planning and operation of the court. Frequently juvenile courts deal so informally with cases reported that it is impossible to determine the number brought to the court's attention or to follow the disposition and subsequent history of a case. This particular

study does not give an accurate picture of the situation since only the most flagrant cases are brought formally to the attention of the court. It is at this point only that the community becomes aware of the need of community planning for a preventive program, rather than earlier, when prevention is more possible.

Margaret C., fifteen, was referred to the prosecuting attorney by the school nurse and the town marshal who complained that she was delinquent, had been associating with men of questionable reputation, and was infected with a venereal disease. The case was referred to the child welfare worker who made a careful study of the situation. The home, consisting of one large cluttered room with no sanitary facilities, was presided over by the mother who presented a dirty and slovenly appearance but who still maintained a certain amount of pride in her family's position. Both the father and mother claimed to know nothing of Margaret's conduct but agreed that they would give her more adequate supervision. A physical examination was negative. The teacher reported that she was an average student, that she had made a satisfactory adjustment with the other students but that her attendance had recently been irregular.

The worker decided that both parents were sincere in their desire to understand the situation better and a plan was formulated whereby Margaret was to remain in the home. The mother was willing to attempt to keep a more presentable home and to include her daughter in plans to make the whole atmosphere more homelike. Because there were seven in the family trying to subsist on the W.P.A. wage of \$40, the welfare office gave an extra \$15 a month in order that special things for the home might be furnished. Assurance was also obtained from the school authorities and the town marshal that they would make a special effort to help Margaret whenever possible. In the light of this cooperation the child welfare worker recommended that Margaret remain in the home under supervision, and at a special chamber hearing the court gave official approval to this plan.

The worker is making regular visits to the home and has established a better relationship and understanding between Margaret and her parents by a careful interpretation of their problems. Her assignment to a definite responsibility in a local W.P.A. recreational program has given her new and beneficial interests.

These two cases demonstrate the need for more careful preparation in matters passing through the hands of the juvenile court. Facilities for such careful preparation are hampered in many cases because of the lack of specialized services which are present in the urban community. There is a definite need for psychological and psychiatric services in rural areas and of special educational provisions for many backward children. However, the most important step at the moment is acquainting the law-enforcing bodies with the advantages to be gained from these services. Although the psychological and psychiatric information obtained by special arrangements about several children committed to the custodial school has not been used by the local board of physicians, it is hoped that subsequent admissions to the school on the basis of this careful preparation will make them conscious of its need. A broader opportunity of community interpretation is possible under this phase of the program since families of both relief and non-relief status are included.

Cooperation With the Training School

The third important phase of the child welfare program is being worked out in cooperation with the state training school. A satisfactory transition from the routine of the institution to the free atmosphere of the home and community is often difficult for the child and every community resource should be utilized in effecting his rehabilitation.

In this state, the training school for boys has two parole officers on its staff, and because of the size of the staff it has been the usual procedure to refer the parolee to a local law-enforcing officer for supervision. With the development of the child welfare program, some boys and

girls are now being referred to the county children's workers after return to their communities.

Harold U., seventeen, paroled from the boys' training school to the sheriff, was referred to the child welfare worker. This boy was adopted at the age of five years after the death of his parents. Very little is known of his parentage except that his own mother died in the state hospital for the insane, and that his father was a ne'er-do-well. The parents explained that he has never had any close friends, that he has been a habitual truant from school, that he does average school work but that he steals and has run away from home without any apparent reason. He had been enrolled in the Civilian Conservation Corps but after being found guilty of bicycle theft, was dishonorably discharged and committed to the State Training School at Chehalis.

Harold knows that he is an adopted child and although his adoptive parents have tried to give him every conceivable advantage, he maintains a feeling of resentment toward them. The deeper underlying factors in this relationship are unknown to the worker at present.

The training school reports indicate that he conformed to discipline, that he took very little interest in his school or his work, preferring to drift along from day to day performing the routine duties assigned to him. A medical examination showed that he was physically well at present, that he had had a head and hand injury in a motorcycle accident at the age of fifteen, and that he had infected tonsils. The Wasserman test was negative.

Harold's chief ambition was to be a truck driver. An uncle gave him a job on the farm at twenty dollars a month but he became dissatisfied and ran away. After an absence of two weeks, he returned and resumed his work without offering any explanation.

How long Harold will remain at home is doubtful. According to his parents, since his release he has set grass fires which destroyed considerable property and has threatened to burn his home if he is not left alone. Much needs to be known of this boy's emotional condition at present and his real attitudes towards his situation. The worker recognizes that this boy's problem may be too deep-seated for her to be of very much help to him. A further effort will be made to understand him and what there is in the situation from which he continually runs away. The worker plans to try psychological and psychiatric examinations to assist in determining his native abilities and aptitudes.

The problem of Harold's adjustment shows not only the need of a better understanding of the individual but shows also some of the facilities lacking in a rural area whereby those needs may be met. Since the boy's examination by specialists cannot be secured locally, he will have to be persuaded to go to the city. Since there are no vocational opportunities in the community, it will be necessary to call upon the statewide vocational rehabilitation program for assistance in working out a plan for his training. While it would ordinarily be of advantage for a boy in this position to remain at home, that is just the very thing that Harold will not do. It is to be hoped that through work with such maladjusted youths as Harold, some spark of community consciousness may be lighted which in time will flame into a definite spirit of concerted attention to such matters.

This followup work of readjusting boys and girls to a community which is already unsympathetic toward them will not become a major problem in this typical rural area as the incidence of delinquency is relatively low and in most cases the adjustment is made before training school discipline is necessary. It is to be noted, however, that a recent request for supervision from the institution gives promise of a closer working relationship with the training school as the program develops.

Although no outstanding results have been accomplished in these cases, they serve to indicate the need for the development of comprehensive interagency relationships. Rural areas are particularly handicapped in the development of a child welfare program because of the lack of adequate facilities for treatment, such as child guidance service, vocational training, recreational facilities, opportunities for employment, boarding homes which meet recognized standards, and character building organizations.

There is a gradual but definite trend in Washington away from the self-sufficient agency operating more or less independently on its own projects toward joint effort and a genuine attempt to coordinate and utilize in a carefully planned program all the resources of the community for the benefit of all the children. Individual communities are assuming responsibility for the development of preventive programs. Welfare councils have been organized to make studies of the underlying causes of delinquency and dependency and the interpretation of their findings has encouraged the expansion of the existing recreational program, educational and work opportunities. The Works Progress Administration has provided staff in cooperation with local facilities to carry out programs in those communities which need assistance in financing and planning.

Working out such relationships has required patient and consistent planning and comprehensive interpretation over a long period of time. Progress has come only as community and agencies become conscious of the need.

V THE YOUNG DELINQUENT



The 'Why' of Bad Boys

JACOB M. BRAUDE

Judge, Municipal Court, Chicago, Illinois

"Who touches a boy, by the Master's plan
Is shaping the course of the future man;
Father or mother or teacher or priest,
Friend or stranger or saint or beast,
Is dealing with one who is living seed
And may be the man whom the world will need."

IN Chicago we have a very interesting and unique institution in our Boys' Court. It is the only court of its kind in this country, so far as I have been able to determine, which deals specifically with boys between the ages of seventeen and twenty-one. We have, too, a juvenile court—the Juvenile Court of Cook County—which happens to be the first juvenile court in the United States. It was created by legislative enactment in 1899 and all the other juvenile courts are patterned after it. In some places these courts are known as children's courts, in other places as courts of domestic relations, and in still other places as family courts, but essentially they are the same in that they deal primarily with the younger boy and the younger girl. But a court which deals exclusively with boys over juvenile court age and under their legal majority is to be found, as I have already indicated, nowhere else but in our city.¹

Prior to 1914 when the Boys' Court was organized as a special branch of our municipal court system, boys

1. Editor's note: The Brooklyn Adolescent Court, a special procedure for selected cases of boys between the ages of sixteen and eighteen, was inaugurated by resolution of the Board of City Magistrates of New York City, October 30, 1934.

over sixteen and under twenty-one were made to stand trial in the same courts as men, and we then found situations where a boy of seventeen or eighteen was brought into court and had his case sandwiched in between, let us say, a man of twenty-five and another of fifty. In those days we had no special facilities, nor was there any opportunity for the presiding judge to adjust himself to deal specifically with the problem of an adolescent boy. I use the word "problem" advisedly because I choose to think of every case which comes into the Boys' Court as a problem that is clamoring for solution, and it is the attempt at the solution of the problem of a bad boy which to me has proved so fascinating and engrossing. As for the Boys' Court itself, I do not like to regard it as only a court, but I rather prefer to think of it as a laboratory where we are concerned with problems affecting the social pathology of adolescence.

Curiously enough the civil side of our common law has always made a distinction between a male person over twenty-one and a male person under twenty-one, and so we find that our civil law has always said, and still says, that a boy under twenty-one is not capable of entering into all types of contracts which are legally enforceable against him, that he may bind himself only to those contracts that are for necessities—that is for food and clothing. All others he may avoid or disaffirm upon reaching his twenty-first birthday. Likewise a boy under twenty-one doesn't have the right of suffrage. There are many other respects in which the civil side of our law recognizes that he has not yet reached that degree of maturity which entitles him to take his place in the community as a full-fledged member of society and fully responsible for his acts.

And yet the criminal side of our law has never made any such distinction. We find instances where as recently

as fifteen years ago boys of fourteen and fifteen were actually put to death for murder in England and in one or two of our eastern states and but recently in my own home city, a boy of fourteen was indicted for murder but the authorities quickly sensed their mistake, quashed the indictment and referred the boy to the juvenile authorities. But we are living in the twentieth century and we like to think that we are making progress. It is easy to see progress in the physical sciences, we have but to look about us and observe such important inventions as the airplane, the radio, and the automobile. We likewise think that we are making progress in the social sciences, and the administration of the criminal law is one branch of that large field.

In the not too distant past it was the generally accepted notion that the punishment or penalty for a crime should be made to fit the crime itself. There is a very strong tendency today to make the punishment fit the individual rather than the crime. We are coming to recognize more and more that individuals differ from one another, that individuals are both the product and the by-product of circumstances and conditions which surround them and over which they have little or no control, that to a great measure the community is responsible for some of the conditions in which individuals find themselves and that these circumstances must be taken into account if we are to deal substantial justice. For instance, we have come to see that while the law recognizes but one kind of age, the chronological, there are several kinds. If a boy was born twenty years ago he is twenty years old, yet he may be chronologically twenty years old and mentally much younger. I have had cases before me where boys have been nineteen or twenty, chronologically, and have exhibited the mentality of boys of eight or nine, even six or seven.

Likewise we have come to recognize that there is such a thing as physiological age. A person may be chronologically twenty, even mentally twenty, but his body functions may be overdeveloped or underdeveloped. This condition frequently makes a difference in the behavior of the individual, and is often responsible for some of the difficulties in which adolescents find themselves. Now if we are to do substantial justice to the individual we must make distinctions based upon actual findings. We must consider some of these persons as not only socially sick, but physically sick as well. We must offer them treatment as sick persons rather than punishment as criminals. These are very important circumstances which should be taken into account in disposing of a case involving a particular individual if equity in the administration of the criminal law is to prevail.

A Boy in Court

Let us take a case that might come into the Boys' Court almost any morning. A name is called and a boy of eighteen is led into the courtroom. The charge against him is burglary, and under the Illinois law burglary is punishable by imprisonment in a state penitentiary for a period of from one year to life. We listen to the evidence adduced in behalf of the state. The complaining witness, the police officers and others testify that the boy broke a lock on a basement door and stole a bicycle. Under our law that is burglary, and if that is all the court listened to it would be justified in finding the defendant guilty and binding him over to the grand jury. The grand jury would, in all likelihood, return an indictment and the boy would then be tried in our criminal court for the specific felony.

If that is what we do it is fairly certain that we have started him on his way to the penitentiary, and in this

connection may I state that there is one thing of which I stand firmly convinced on the basis of my years of experience in the Boys' Court, and that is that *we do not save souls nor salvage human material by sending anybody to jail*. I am satisfied in my own mind that penal institutions do not cure social ills and that reformatories do not reform. Especially is this true in the case of a boy. Put a boy behind bars for as short a period of time as a week or ten days and you do his moral fabric irreparable damage. He comes out very frequently much worse than he went in, having learned a lot of things he never knew before. He comes out having made contacts or associates which if pursued later on will spell only added trouble for him. He comes out all too often determined to get even with the society which has imprisoned him for something which he didn't think was wrong in the first place.

It wasn't so long ago that there stood before me a boy of nineteen. He looked rather pale and wan and haggard, and I said to him, "Son, where have you been?" He replied, "I just got out of the 'House of Corruption.'" What he really meant, of course, was the House of Correction. Doubtless he had never seen the words in print, probably did not know how to spell it, and to him it sounded like "House of Corruption." And if any of you have ever seen the House of Correction which we have in Chicago—our municipal workhouse—you will appreciate that he could have said "House of Corruption," and meant it in every sense of the word.

I repeat, I do not believe in sending these boys—young men in fact—to jail, especially if they are first offenders, for I subscribe to this philosophy: that if the law curiously enough says that a dog is entitled to at least one bite before the law pronounces him mad and says that he must be done away with, then most people will agree with me that every boy is entitled to at least one chance before

we stamp him as a criminal with a criminal record to dog him for the rest of his days.

So let us return to this boy who stands before us charged with burglary. So far as the records show he has never before been in trouble and we must treat him as a first offender. In this connection may I interrupt myself to comment that all too often when we get boys in court it is much too late to do anything for them. The time to save them is long before they have ever been tempted to make their first mistake. Take the case of a boy who has managed to get away with mischief of one kind or another let us say ten times before he is apprehended. Then comes his first appearance in court. So far as we know at the time he is a first offender, and yet if we treat him as a first offender and give him what we call a "break," we are apt to do him more harm than good, because if we set him free he is likely to begin to think to himself, "Now what mistake did I make this eleventh time that was responsible for my getting caught?" He then goes out and tries to improve on his technique, and of course sooner or later he is in trouble again and back in court. The result is we feel we are obliged to punish him and punishment invariably spells ruin. That is why I repeat to you what you have heard so often before: that if we are going to help most of these boys we must help them long before they are tempted to make their first mistake. Crime prevention must begin in the high chair and not in the electric chair.

If we are going to do what I choose to call "social prophylaxis" and save these boys and help them we must undertake to do something for them long before they have had a taste of what they think is easy money. Take the case of a boy who has been looking for employment but who has been unable to find it; a boy who has all the normal desires that a boy of his age should have—who

wants to go to a movie once in a while, who wants to take his girl friend out, who wants to buy a hot dog after the show, or take himself to the beach on a hot summer's afternoon. If he isn't working and if his family cannot afford to give him pocket money he is going to steal that money. Our actual court experiences show us that. He doesn't read about it in the newspapers, his own ingenious mind will think up some easy way—at least he thinks it is easy—whereby he can get this money. And so along about one or two o'clock early some Sunday morning he plants himself outside the door of a tavern located in one of our large industrial neighborhoods and there he waits until some workman who has just been paid for the week finally staggers out homeward bound with what remains of his pay. Our boy follows him until they are opposite some dark alley where he "puts the arm" on him, in their own language, and in going through his pockets comes away with say \$20 or \$25. He is never apprehended or if he is, his victim because of his drunken condition, would in all probability be unable to identify him. It is pretty hard to put that boy to work thereafter for ten or twelve dollars a week. He keeps thinking back to how easy it was to make that much money or even twice that much with just a few minutes' effort. He has had a taste of what he thinks is easy money and from that time on that boy is a problem to himself, his family, and society. And so, if we really want to be of help to him and others like him we must do something for him long before he is tempted.

Now let us go back to our boy of eighteen who stands before us charged with burglary. Having heard the state's evidence and being unconvinced that the boy should be sent to the grand jury, we turn to the boy and say, "Well, son, what's your story?" And the story which he tells us in simple and sincere fashion may be any one of

several variations of a single theme. He may tell us that one afternoon while walking through the passageway between two buildings he chanced to look through a basement window where he saw a bicycle covered with dust and apparently not in use. In his simple mind he couldn't understand why a perfectly good bicycle should go to waste, and so after dusk he returned, broke the lock on the basement door and made off with the bicycle. A few days later he was apprehended, arrested, and brought into the Boys' Court charged with burglary, a crime that might possibly have sent him to the penitentiary for a period of one year to life.

Or he may tell us another story. He may tell us that winter was on its way and that all summer long he had been running around in a pair of rubber soled gymnasium shoes. The soles were wearing through and he needed a new pair. His father was on relief and there were six or eight mouths to be fed. He didn't know where or how he was to get another pair of shoes but when he saw this bicycle he felt his problem was solved and so he broke the lock on the door, stole the bicycle, sold it for whatever he could get and bought himself a pair of shoes, a zipper jacket, or a sweater, or whatever else he might have needed only to find himself in court a defendant on a serious charge.

Or he might tell us yet another story: that all winter long he had been cooped up indoors but that finally spring reared its head behind the winter clouds and the great outdoors beckoned and the boys began to congregate around the street corners looking for fun and excitement. One of the boys recalled a bicycle he had seen lying in a basement apparently not being used, and so they flip a coin to see which would steal it and our defendant loses the toss and is the one to make away with the bicycle, thereafter being charged with a specific crime.

These things actually happen. It was not so long ago that I had a boy before me who was arrested in just such circumstances. He and another boy had flipped a coin to see which of the two was to snatch a lady's purse, and of course the one who lost the toss won his day in court. Or the boy might tell us yet a fourth story. Somehow or other when boys get to be eighteen or nineteen or twenty, they acquire girl friends and girl friends require attention, and so here we have this boy out of work and a girl friend on his mind. Christmas is on its way or Valentine's Day or her birthday, and he feels he must show his interest in her. He hasn't any money, can't get it at home and isn't working, but he wants to buy her a gift and so he steals the bicycle and with the proceeds buys her a watch or bracelet or some other trinket he thinks she would like, and then he winds up in court. Interestingly enough, the girl, in nine out of ten cases, will be right there with him, and although she does not want to see her boy friend go to jail just try to separate her from the watch.

Procedure in Court

Now, it is just such a boy as this who stands before us. Send him to jail? Yes, if we want to forget about him and check him off our list as far as future usefulness is concerned. What do we do? The technique which we have perfected in cooperation with the state's attorney's office is to change the charge from a more serious one—in this case a burglary charge—to a lesser charge. In this case it would be petit larceny, a misdemeanor. After the charge has been changed we go through the routine of an arraignment and a plea. The testimony for both sides on the new charge is of course the same. The law being what it is and the facts what they are, applying one to the other there is only one conclusion to which the court can

come and that is that the defendant is guilty. But having found the defendant guilty the court may then use its discretion as to what final disposition to make of the case. We want to give this boy a chance. How to do it? We may grant him probation, which as we know is the legally recognized method of giving a convicted defendant an opportunity to prove outside of the confines of a penal institution that he has learned his lesson, and that having learned it, he will no longer offend. And I am a firm believer in the system of probation just as I firmly believe in parole.

We read much in the newspapers these days in criticism of both probation and parole, but frequently newspapers confuse and befog the issues. What many of these newspapers mean to criticize is not probation and parole but the administration of these systems, and with this criticism in some instances I have no quarrel. But were we to abolish probation and parole as we have them today, we should be going back at least a half century in progress. Yet while I believe in the extensive use of probation it has, in the case of boys, its limitations.

As we all know, before the court can put a defendant on probation he must first be found guilty, and having found him guilty we give him a criminal record. In the case of an adult there can be little objection to giving a convicted defendant a criminal record because by not sending him to jail we are giving him a break. If after having been granted probation, he gets into trouble that previous record really counts against him and it properly should. But in the case of a boy it doesn't always work out that way. Let us go back to this eighteen year old lad who has been brought before us and stands convicted of petit larceny. What got him into trouble was the fact that he wanted something he did not own, something that money could buy. Had he had a job he

probably would not have been tempted to steal, and so let us say we want to grant him probation and give him a chance to make good. We say to him, "You have now had a taste of what it is to be in trouble. Go out and get yourself a job, earn some money. With the money which you earn, buy something. You will want other people to respect your rights in the property which you have purchased with money for which you have worked hard. You will then learn to respect the property rights of others. Now go out and get a job and make a useful citizen of yourself, and don't come back here again unless it is to tell us how well you have succeeded."

Now let us assume that the boy takes us quite seriously. Bright and early the next morning he is out looking for a job. Where does he go? Naturally to one of the large firms which have special employment offices. In our city it would be Armour and Company, Sears Roebuck, International Harvester, Montgomery Ward, or the like. Dressed up in his newest suit, eager for an opportunity, with a firm step he climbs the stairs of the employment office and applies for a position. He is handed an application blank which he proceeds to fill out and he gets along very nicely until he gets to question ten, and then he is puzzled. The question is "Have you ever been in trouble?" or "Have you ever been convicted of a crime?" He knows that if he says "yes" he isn't going to get the job, because there are too many boys who have not been convicted of a crime for an employer to waste time trying to find out what kind of trouble this boy has been in. Let us assume that he lies about it and says that he has never been in trouble and on the strength of the lie gets the job. One doesn't have to be a profound student of psychology to appreciate that a boy working under a strain of this kind will not be able to give the best that there is in him. He will be constantly haunted by the

fear that his probation officer is going to call on him some day at work, and that his employer is going to discover that he has working for him a boy who has a criminal record and that it may mean the loss of his job, so that even if he gets the job on the strength of the lie we haven't done all for him that we should.

But let us assume further that he has told the truth and that he has been turned down. He goes to a second place and again he is handed an application and this time it may be question twelve that stares him in the face. "Have you ever been convicted of a crime?" Let us assume that he tells the truth, and again he doesn't get the job. That boy walks out of that place muttering to himself "What's the use of trying to go straight? People won't give you a chance." We haven't helped that boy. If anything, we have hurt him. We have placed him right back on the streets again, back to doing those same things which were originally responsible for his difficulty.

Now what we want to do is to help this boy. How can we do it? We have done it in our court by developing a system of extralegal supervision which enables us to grant a special form of probation without giving the convicted defendant a criminal record. In short, the technique is this: having found the defendant guilty the court of its own accord enters a motion to vacate the finding and sentence, and continues that motion for a period of three, six, nine or even twelve months, depending upon what the particular case may demand or require. The defendant is released on his individual bond and is then turned over for supervision to a representative of the particular group to which he belongs. In this connection I should like to call your attention to the fact that there are four extralegal agencies which work in close conjunction with the court, each of which has a representative in daily attendance. There is the Holy Name Society, representing the

Catholic group, the Chicago Church Federation, representing the Protestants, the Jewish Social Service Bureau, and the Colored Big Brothers Association. If during the period of supervision the boy responds favorably to the treatment which we try to give him, when his case comes up for disposition on a motion to vacate we suspend that motion and discharge the defendant. The record then officially reads, "Finding of not guilty. Defendant discharged." The boy may honestly look people in the face and say that he has never been convicted of a charge. Our police records fail to show the conviction. Of course, we keep a record in the Boys' Court, and should the boy come back a second time we then know his previous difficulty even though the police records contain no reference to it, and of course the second time we do not give the defendant that same consideration which we undertake to give first offenders.

Of all the boys who are given a second chance in this way, 72 per cent do not repeat while they are of Boys' Court age, and of the 28 per cent who reappear many come back on minor or insignificant charges. This record I am sure justifies us in concluding that our experiment in Chicago which is nearly a quarter of a century old has proved its worth and should be continued.

So much for the way in which the court itself functions. When I was first assigned to the Boys' Court in June of 1935 it was with the understanding that I would serve there for at least one year and possibly two or more, and for a few days some of my friends reminded me that some years ago one of the judges who preceded me in that court just couldn't take it any longer and jumped out of the window right in that courtroom and committed suicide. And not long after that another judge in that court after a year and a half of service suffered a complete nervous breakdown. After I had been there a few days I

could see for myself the reason for all this. I saw and heard things daily which most people don't read about in newspapers, magazines or story books—things that people generally know nothing about unless they are professionally in the work. And very soon I began to have bad dreams and nightmares. Realizing that this would be a daily diet for some time to come I resolved to try to do something about it and so I searched for some antidote or antitoxin to offset this social poison which was given off from the courtroom each day. I reasoned with myself that the only way in which I could overcome all this was to try to do something to help some of these unfortunate boys. Better still, that I should try if possible to keep some of these boys from becoming involved in the first instance.

Understanding Causes

In order to do this I should first have to find out why boys get into trouble. And so after talking to the boys, our court psychiatrists, our social service officers, probation officers, parents, and others, I have come to some definite conclusions as to what things are responsible for boys getting into difficulty with the law. I don't call them the causes of crime because the causes of crime are too deep-seated and too deep-rooted, but I do call them predisposing factors or tendencies. In the first place I say to you that to allow youngsters to play with destructive toys or games of one kind or another has a tendency to get them into trouble. I don't mean by that that every child who plays with a toy gun is going to develop into a hoodlum or gangster, but I do think that a child who is used to pointing a toy gun and pulling its trigger will find it much easier to pull the trigger of a real gun than the child who has been taught to fear and respect the use of firearms. A child may tire of a toy gun and reach into

the right hand dresser drawer and take out his daddy's real gun. If he does not hurt himself he may harm his playmate. If he is old enough he may take it to school with him, and if he is weak and foolish enough he may be tempted to go out and "pull a job" with it.

Next I mention the influence of improper literature, not only the indecent type which is responsible for many crimes of sex and violence, but also the wrong type of adventure story. Not so many months ago two boys were arrested early one morning in the men's washroom of the Northwestern Depot in Chicago. One of the boys carried a fully loaded revolver, which was almost as big as he. Brought into court and asked what they had been doing, one of the boys told me a very frank story of how he had been reading in one of the cheap adventure magazines how two boys worked their way around the world for two years. They left without any money and came back without any, but they were rich in thrills, excitement and experience. These two boys before me were out to do exactly the same thing, but they thought they had discovered a short cut. Why work? So they took a gun which belonged to an uncle of one and set out on their way. They reasoned in their immature minds that it would be relatively simple to hold up one person in each town as they made their way. They got as far as Itasca, Illinois, a small town eighteen or nineteen miles northwest of Chicago. One of the boys got cold feet and they flipped a train back to Chicago and there they were in the men's washroom trying to make up their minds what they should do about it. Fortunately for them they were apprehended and brought into court. We brought their parents in. We talked to the boys and to the parents and I like to think that we straightened those boys out. At least we have not heard from them since, and until we do I give them the benefit of the doubt. But this one in-

stance I give to demonstrate what may lead to trouble for boys trying to do in real life those things which are purely figments of imagination of some wild fiction writer.

Next, I mention the influence of the marijuana weed, increasingly a problem in some of our large cities. These cigarettes which are peddled for as little as a nickel or two cents each in the neighborhood of high schools have been responsible for starting many of our adolescents on the road to crime. The police have found groups that have formed clubs and rented rooms where they sit in the afternoon and smoke these reefers as they call them. Our problem is complicated by the fact that this weed grows wild in many places, can be grown in the backyard, or even in flower pots on window sills. Its effect is frequently much more potent and serious than that of an alcoholic drink. Many of those addicted to morphine, cocaine and other deadly narcotics had their start from marijuana.

Alcoholic liquor is a contributing factor in adolescent delinquency. Between 30 and 35 per cent of all boys we get in the Boys' Court come there as a result of alcoholic liquor. Not only do boys commit crimes while under the influence of liquor but they actually go out and steal the money with which to buy it. While we have plenty of laws which prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquor to minors they are difficult to enforce. To really do something about this feature of the problem we shall have to look to the home, the school, and the church for assistance.

I next refer to the movies, the radio, and the comic strip. The movies have done a good deal to clean house for themselves. We do not see as many gangster pictures as we used to. Recently I noticed a picture title, "The Last Gangster." If this is just another gangster picture then we still have cause for concern. If it really means the last of the gangster pictures then we should be happy,

and that goes for the radio and comic strip. We have many programs on the air which sponsors tell us will, they hope, teach the lesson that crime does not pay. There are many comic strips published in our daily papers which ostensibly have the same thought in mind, but unfortunately the lesson is lost on those for whom it is intended. All the youngsters get out of it are the "Bang! Bang! Bang!" and the glory and the glamour and excitement and thrill, and there is aroused within them the desire to go out and do the same thing. And so I mention these as being contributing factors.

The automobile too plays its part. In our own state, and I hang my head in shame when I say it, we have no driver's license law and no driver's financial responsibility law. Today in the City of Chicago a boy—in fact, anybody—can walk onto a used car lot and by paying three or five dollars down drive off with some broken-down jalopy which a previous owner had discarded as unfit for use. No examination is required, no showing of responsibility—nothing at all but a small down payment and a tank full of gasoline. Our trouble in this connection comes chiefly during the month of June when high schools let out and colleges break up. These young men with nothing but time on their hands and a summer filled with fun and enjoyment to look forward to, pool their resources, one putting up fifty cents, another a dollar, and the one who puts up two dollars usually takes title and takes the car home with him at night. He really doesn't take it home at all but parks it a block or two from where he lives as his parents are not supposed to know that he has the car. The next day bright and early some six or seven of them crowd into the five-seater and off they go, turning corners frequently on two wheels and having little regard for their own safety or the safety of others. Soon they run out of gasoline and run out of funds too. Being

unemployed they are unable to earn the money with which to buy gasoline. They cannot ask for money at home and so they put their heads together and one of the boys remembers that he once took a course in physics while at school and learned something about the principle of siphoning, and from then on it's your gas and my gas which is taking them around and getting them in trouble.

Next I refer to the influence of unsupervised and uncontrolled street gangs and basement or cellar clubs. There are certain sections of our city which are infested with these basement clubs and they present a serious problem. Frequently they call themselves social or athletic clubs. In the summer time they are athletic clubs and in the winter time social clubs, and I should hate to tell you some of the things that go on in those basements under the heading of "social activities." Recently I had a boy of nineteen before me. He was married and came from a section of the city where I knew they had many of these clubs. I inquired whether or not he belonged to a club. He told me that he had belonged to one, the "Bachelors' Den," for five years. Imagine this boy a member of the "Bachelors' Den" ever since he was fourteen. These two words tell the story more effectively than I could tell it in many hundreds of words.

These clubs cannot be broken up by battering down their doors with a sledge hammer. These boys want to organize just as you and I. Among them we call it the gang spirit, among ourselves the social spirit. They want to lead and be led. They want to have their presidents and treasurers and they want to black-ball and elect members. They want to have their social affairs and parties, and it is for us to recognize this spirit as a normal one and then proceed to do something constructive about it. Yes, these clubs should be broken up, but we must give the boys something else in their place. We need more

Boy Scout troops, Y. M. C. A.'s, community centers, young people's groups or alliances attached to churches, where these boys can get everything that they want and need but where they can get it under wholesome supervision and direction and under proper guidance and leadership.

Next I mention the influence of home life as an important factor. Many of our boys come from broken homes—homes where there are no parents at all or where the parents have been separated or where there are step-parents, and it is not always the step-parent who is to blame. Very frequently it is the stepchild who is unable to adjust himself to his environment. But all too often parents think that they can live one kind of life themselves and expect of their growing children an altogether different kind of life. It just will not work! Especially is this true where children love and respect their parents, for then their parents can do no wrong, and if it is good enough for the parents it must be good enough for them. This is well expressed by Edgar Guest in lines which he has given me his permission to repeat:

It is all in vain to preach of the truth,
To the eager ears of a trusting youth,
If, whenever the lad is standing by,
He sees you cheat and he hears you lie:
Fine words may grace the advice you give,
But youth will learn from the way you live.

Honor's a word that a thief may use,
High-sounding language the base may choose.
Speech is empty and preaching vain,
Though the truth shines clear and the lesson's plain;
If you play false he will turn away,
For your life must square to the things you say.

He won't tread the path of your righteous talk,
But will follow the path which you daily walk.
'Not as I do, but do as I say,'

Won't win him to follow the better way;
Through the thin veneer of your speech he'll see,
Unless you're the man you would have him be.

The longer you live you will find this true:
As you would teach, you must also do.
Bounded sentences, smooth and fair,
Were better not said if your deeds aren't square.
If you'd teach him to live to his very best
You must live your life to the self-same test.

More important than all of these as a specific factor in causing delinquency is idleness or unemployment. When I first went into the Boys' Court fully 90 per cent of the boys who came before me were not attending school, were out of work and unemployed. When the W. P. A., the C. C. C., and the N. Y. A. began, they absorbed some of these and that figure fell to 65 per cent. Having come to the conclusion that there is a direct relationship between idleness and crime, I set about to see if there wasn't something I could do to help some of these boys find jobs. And so in November of 1934 I dispatched a series of letters to some of the larger employers in Chicago and in my appeal to them I said:

In the Boys' Court each day I see a steady stream, a daily parade of boys in trouble. Some of these boys are definitely antisocial and bad, and we treat them as such, but a good many others are in trouble simply because they haven't had the opportunity to earn those few dollars which might have kept them out of trouble. Your company spends thousands of dollars annually by way of taxes to help maintain and support penal and corrective institutions which are intended to take care of boys *after* they get in trouble. Why not spend just a few dollars and try to keep some boy from getting into trouble? The way to do this is to make up your mind that this year you are going to take on an added expenditure which you did not have last year, that you are going to make at least one job for a boy whether you need him or not, that you will spend five hundred or a thousand dollars this year without hope for any direct return and that having created the job you will let me send you the boy to fill it.

It may amaze you just as it amazed me that on the basis of this appeal we placed 108 boys within some three or four months, and that of the boys we placed in this manner all but two made good.

But as you well know one cannot always keep things out of the newspapers. Things we should like to get in receive scant notice. Things we should like to keep out frequently manage to make the front pages. And so it was that the news hawks around the courtroom picked up the story of the judge trying to find jobs for boys instead of sending them to jail. I suppose to them it was like the case of a man biting a dog. They printed some pieces about it and the result was that I received more than two thousand letters from other boys asking me if I wouldn't help them get jobs. I am still getting them daily. Some of these letters are very interesting, some very pathetic, some highly amusing. For instance, one boy wrote me as follows:

Dear Judge: I read with interest in the Herald and Examiner where you are offering jobs to boys who face minor court charges. I am twenty-two years of age and was a bank clerk for three and one-half years and a general office clerk for one and one-half years. It seems my only difficulty in getting a job is that I am honest. Could you please recommend some minor offense for me to commit so that I too might be eligible for your employment plan for unfortunate youths?

I suppose you find this rather amusing, and at this late date I am able to join in laughing at it, but at the time I was very much concerned and I was afraid that the very thing which I hoped would be of some constructive value might turn out to be a boomerang. But fortunately no case has come to my attention where a boy has deliberately gone out and committed a crime so that he might be provided with a job. I have a number of letters which while they perhaps express their ideas more effectively are no

different from hundreds of others which I have received. Listen to this one :

Dear Judge: Having read about your intentions of finding work for about 500 boys I am writing to you in the hope that you may do something for me.

I am a young man twenty-one years of age who has lost both his parents, and haven't anyone to depend on to give me a place to sleep and at least one good meal a day. I have tramped the streets for many months looking for work of any nature without very much success, and I am getting just a bit disgusted in having to miss my meals so often.

I have always been a law-abiding citizen, have never been in a police station on any charge except once and that was for a night's lodging. I have been getting some queer ideas lately and I only hope I do not carry them through, although I'm sure that if you were in my place you'd understand what it is to get a kick in the pants every way you seem to turn.

I tried to get into the Army, the Navy and the flying corps, but could not pass because of being three-quarters of an inch below specified height. Went for relief and was told that nothing could be done for me because I had had no permanent place of residence for the past year. I tried to get into the C.C.C. camps and was told that to enlist I would have to be on the relief rolls. Where they wanted to send me to get me a break in life was to a flophouse. Well, if I have any intentions of becoming a bum or a thief I can do very well by myself without any of their help.

I passed one complete winter sleeping in hallways, garages, basements and what not, and I swore by the Almighty I wouldn't again even if I had to start working overtime with a lead pipe. And so help me, God, I will, if my luck doesn't start to change mighty soon because I have come to the end of the rope.

Why is it that a boy born and raised in the United States has no chance of getting work? I am willing to take any kind of work. I am not interested in salary but more in my future. Hoping to hear from you soon, . . .

And here is another :

Dear Judge: 'Knowledge is power.' So said Mr. Bacon, English philosopher of the seventeenth century, and Judge, it's a hideous lie. Witness the many students who have completed their courses in the various professions, helpless and jobless.

I left school two years ago when only eighteen and have not as yet been able to secure employment. Having learned that Mr. Kelly of the Fair was willing to employ young men I wrote a letter to him requesting such. I was advised by letter to see you concerning the position there. I spent over two hours in your courtroom yesterday trying to see you. I went to the washroom and when I returned it was all over. The boys told me that you suggested that we write you a letter so I borrowed a dime, judge, for this special delivery stamp in order that you might quickly receive my letter and grant me an interview, assistance—anything! God knows, I need it.

I have looked for a job for so long, I have tried so hard that it just seems hopeless. I now appreciate the visible streak of hardness present in the makeup of certain people. I once believed in opportunity and fairness and all the finer things of life. I don't know what others think about them, but now I consider them all exquisitely 'blah!'

As a matter of actual fact I once won a medal speaking about education. Not an ordinary medal either—a state medal—I was a state winner. I prized it and I considered it an honor, but a golden medal once prized has become just a hunk of iron that sneers and mocks me on every occasion.

I live in Chicago's slummiest district. I have tried to rise above it, but what's the good of it, Judge? I have been slashed, lashed and bashed physically, mentally and morally. Born and raised here and still not a chance. **NOT A CHANCE!**

Do you wonder why so many boys go wrong? The very things which make for a criminal career are being forced—**FORCED**—into my hands and when things look blurred and you are losing your grip it is terribly difficult to face and fight the knots and snarls of life honestly.

You've got to help me, Judge. Please. Please help me to retain my perspective. Talk to me—get me a job—anything, but please, for God's sake, do something, and I'll be ever so grateful. I want to do the right thing, but it's hard, Judge, damnably hard.

Waiting and hoping to hear from you, . . .

Don't worry about these two boys. They are among the 108 we placed to work. But how about the other two thousand or more who wrote me? If there are two thousand who wrote at that time there must be ten thousand others who wanted to write but could not, and some

may not even have had the two cents with which to mail a letter.

That is the problem and it is a problem that concerns not alone a judge in a Boys' Court who does this because of the personal satisfaction that comes to him from the doing. It is a problem that should be recognized as a civic responsibility. It is a problem which concerns all of us, my friends, you and your friends. It reminds me very much of the story of the young man who was standing in the trenches during the war and the bullets were whizzing by overhead and he was trembling from tip to toe. And the company chaplain happened along and noticed his plight and said to him, "My son, what are you so worried about? Every bullet that comes over has a name on it. If it has your name on it it is going to get you and nothing is going to save you. If it hasn't your name on it, it isn't intended for you. So why don't you just cheer up and take things as they come?"

And the boy looked back into his eyes and said, "Father, I am not worried about the bullets that come over here with my name on them. I know they are meant for me. And I am not concerned about the bullets that come over here that don't have my name on them. What worries me are all the bullets that come over here with nothing on them but 'To Whom It May Concern.'" And so I say to you that these two thousand or more letters, while they are aimed or directed at me, are really intended for "Whom It May Concern."

And so if there is ever anything that any of you can do at any time to help some boy get a job when he needs it most—long before he is ever tempted to make that first mistake which will too often prove so fatal—you will be doing something to save that boy for himself, for his family and his community.



The Child in the Federal Court

RICHARD A. CHAPPELL

Supervisor, Probation System, United States Courts

IN CONSIDERING legislation affecting children in the federal courts, we must keep in mind the fundamental differences in the authority of the Federal Government and the state governments over children. The powers of the state in respect to children are far broader than the authority of the Federal Government. An infant is a ward of the state and the state government may deal with him accordingly. The relationship of guardian and ward does not exist between the Federal Government and an infant. The Federal Government may step in only when a federal offense is committed by the infant, just as it may deal with an adult when the latter is guilty of a violation of a federal statute. The Federal Government cannot approach the problem of juvenile delinquency from the same standpoint that the state governments may consider it. We should be guided by the same ideals and standards as are found in the better juvenile courts in the states, but we are restricted in our efforts to achieve these because we must work within the legal framework of the criminal laws.

The Federal Government under our system of dual sovereignty is a government of delegated powers only. All authority not specifically given to the central government reposes in the states. The states retain the right to be placed in *loco parentis*, but this power was not delegated to the Federal Government. The states inherited many common law powers over offenders that the Federal Government does not have while our federal courts have jurisdiction only in statutory crime. Therefore

the states can approach this broad problem of juvenile delinquency from a much better vantage point than can the Federal Government. The states under their sovereign power have set up juvenile courts dealing with children which follow chancery procedure. The Federal Government, because of its lack of authority, is forced to deal with children within the framework of criminal procedural machinery which is geared to accomplish a different purpose.

Realizing our limitations, we announced on August 14, 1931, a general policy of diverting to state jurisdiction, children who had committed offenses against the United States, and we still stand strongly by this policy and urge the cooperation of the state services. We expect to insist more vigorously than ever that federal offenders be diverted to local juvenile courts. The machinery was provided for this policy on June 11, 1932, when Congress passed an enabling bill by which we may forego prosecution of a child in the federal courts and surrender to the state authorities persons under twenty-one years of age, whenever it is to the best interests of the United States and of the delinquent child.

The President, in signing the law, said:

It is a recognition by the Federal Government that the juvenile court is the proper place for the handling of cases of juveniles, and is an acceptance of the principle that juvenile offenders are the products of and the responsibility of their home communities.

In furtherance of this policy, Congress went so far as to provide for the expense of the return of any juvenile offender from the place of his arrest to his home for a hearing in the local juvenile court. If a child is apprehended in a stolen automobile in Seattle, for instance, he can be returned to Nevada or Florida and be surrendered to the local juvenile authorities.

But regardless of these desirable provisions, experience has taught us that children in many communities are still being put through the strict legalistic procedures which are generally utilized for adults. Some of the factors involved in the breakdown of our diversion policy were pointed out by the United States Children's Bureau in its report on federal juvenile offenders for the year ending June 30, 1935. The comments of the report are as follows:

The failure to divert a larger proportion of cases has been largely due to the following obstacles:

1. State facilities for the care of juveniles are lacking or inadequate in many localities.
2. Where adequate facilities exist, they frequently are not available for the older juveniles, especially those eighteen years of age, who make up a large percentage of the federal juvenile offenders. Such older juveniles therefore, in many cases, can be more effectively held by the federal courts than by state courts.
3. Federal probation service is frequently preferable to the use of the available state facilities.
4. Likewise, the facilities available to the Federal Government for institutional treatment are often superior to those available to the states.

The situation described at that time is still true today. Our diversion policy has worked fairly well in a few jurisdictions, but there are far too many children passing through federal courts in jurisdictions where there are no standard juvenile courts or where the diversion policy has proved unsuccessful. In those jurisdictions where it has worked we shall continue to use it, but feeling that the time was ripe when we must face the facts and be practical about the matter, we began recently considering improvement of our own federal court procedure for juveniles.

James V. Bennett, director of the Bureau of Prisons, in the April issue of *Federal Probation*, the house organ of the probation system, had the following to say:

As the Federal Government has assumed an ever widening jurisdiction over criminal acts, it has been more and more apparent that the existing machinery is sadly in need of revision. Nothing could be more out of tune with the modern concept of juvenile delinquency than our present system of bringing the juvenile before a committing magistrate, remanding him to jail, presenting him to the grand jury, trying him in open court, and then incarcerating him in some remote institution. . . .

Last year almost 2500 juvenile cases were tried in federal courts under the awkward procedures I have indicated. There is a considerable number of juvenile federal offenders who cannot for various reasons be diverted to state authorities. They ought to be treated in federal courts in a manner analogous to the best juvenile court practice. A way must be found to detain juveniles in places other than the unsatisfactory county jail. Isn't it absurd for the Federal Government to place a boy or girl who is awaiting hearing on a federal charge in a lockup or jail when the state statute forbids the use of such crime breeders for the cases over which it has jurisdiction? Is the central government maintaining its alleged leadership when one may still witness the public trial of a federal juvenile offender in accordance with criminal procedure and methods which have been prohibited for violators of parallel state statutes?

Federal Delinquency Act

After consultation with representatives of the United States Children's Bureau and with other specialists in the field of juvenile delinquency, we drafted a bill known as the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act¹ which the Attorney General, the Honorable Homer S. Cummings, recommended to Congress for enactment into law. The principal features of this new measure are:

1. It applies to all persons seventeen years of age or under.

1. U. S. Stat. 1938, c. 486. Approved June 16, 1938.

2. It applies to all federal offenses committed by juveniles other than offenses punishable by death or life in prison. Such offenses we could not include because the Constitution of the United States requires an indictment by a grand jury in those cases. However, they are exceedingly rare. The bill provides that the Attorney General may elect to proceed against all persons who come within the purview of the act as *juvenile delinquents*.

3. Juvenile delinquents are to be proceeded against by information, and to be given a hearing without a jury before a district judge, who may hold court for that purpose at any time or any place within the district, either in chambers or elsewhere. The consent of the juvenile is, however, required before he can be proceeded against under this Juvenile Delinquency Act, instead of being prosecuted for the substantive offense. This consent is necessary because the Constitution guarantees the right to a trial by jury. However, the courts have held that this constitutional right can be waived by a child just as it can by adults.

4. In the event that a child is found to be a delinquent, he may be placed on probation or may be committed to the custody of the Attorney General for a period not exceeding his minority, but in no event exceeding the term for which he could have been sentenced if he had been convicted of a substantive offense. The Attorney General is empowered, through the director of the Bureau of Prisons, to designate any agency for the custody and care of such juveniles. This provision makes possible the use of either state or private institutions for detention or for custody and education as well as training of the child. The bill further provides that the Attorney General is to be notified of the arrest of any child and may provide for his detention in a juvenile home. The purpose of this provision is to reduce the detention of

children in common jails to a minimum. Under our present arrangement they can be and very often are detained in jails with adult offenders. Under the new statute a juvenile detained in a jail or similar institution shall be held in custody in a room or other place apart from adults, if such facilities are available. The Act specifically says:

Wherever a juvenile is arrested on a charge of having committed an offense against the laws of the United States, the arresting officer shall immediately notify the Attorney General of such fact. If such juvenile is not forthwith taken before a committing magistrate, he may be detained in such juvenile home or other suitable place of detention as the Attorney General may designate for such purposes, but shall not be detained in a jail or similar place of detention unless in the opinion of the arresting officer such detention is necessary to secure the custody of such juvenile, to insure his safety or that of others. In no case shall such detention be for a longer period than is necessary to produce such juvenile before a committing magistrate. The committing magistrate may release such juvenile on bail, on his own recognizance or that of some responsible person, or in default of bail, may commit him to the custody of the United States marshal who shall lodge him in such juvenile home or other suitable place as the Attorney General may designate for that purpose.

We believe that this provision may reduce to almost the vanishing point the necessity for detaining children in common jails.

The Act also gives the United States Board of Parole power to parole juveniles at any time. The parole board, as you know, has available all the facilities of our United States probation service.

There are other things that we should have liked incorporated in the bill. It is not ideal as it stands but we think it is a great step in the right direction. Perhaps after we have had experience in administering it for a while we shall find that changes can be made through amendments. I am sure that those of you who are familiar with

federal judicial procedure will agree with me that this is quite a departure from the routine channels through which offenders against the federal laws have passed heretofore.

Just as we shall continue to depend upon the local juvenile courts for treatment of those cases which we find that we can divert, so we shall now have to depend upon child placement agencies and other social agencies to assist us in the administration of this new law. Suitable places for detention and training of these children must be found. We hope that proper detention facilities will be substituted for jails, and that boarding homes in many instances can be substituted for training schools and other institutions. We ask the cooperation of juvenile court officials and social workers to this end.

VI BOARDING HOMES FOR DELINQUENT CHILDREN



Boarding Home Care for the Delinquent Child

DONALD E. LONG

Judge, Court of Domestic Relations, Portland, Oregon

A CONVENIENT point of departure in the discussion of boarding home care in relation to the juvenile court is a concept that has slowly but steadily emerged from the changing, sometimes conflicting, but always progressive social attitudes that color the history of scientific consideration of children's behavior. I refer to the belief, now widely held among those who have given any study and reflection to the matter, that the so-called delinquent child in no way actually differs from the normal child. Some authorities even claim that the only point of variance between the two is that the former has been detected or apprehended, while the latter, whose impulses and conduct parallel that of his delinquent brother in every essential particular, simply has not had the misfortune—or good fortune—to be reported to the court as an offender.

Without wholly subscribing to this extremely undifferentiated point of view, we can admit the fundamental correctness of regarding all children as substantially alike in their psychic mechanism and in the behavior trends that are the overt manifestations, the dynamic expression of these mechanisms. Allowing for individual variation of all kinds, biological, hereditary, racial and so forth, our

studies still show us that all children respond to stimuli in a similar way—and for that matter, so do adults. For adult behavior cannot, I believe, be differentiated qualitatively from infant or adolescent behavior; it is strictly a matter of degree.

What produces our behavior problems, generally speaking, is not types or individuals, but the environment that conditions the response of individuals to given situations. Naturally there is considerable variation in the situations in which individuals find themselves, differences giving rise to an infinite variety of behavior patterns. It might be said that human behavior is a product of two variables, environment and situation, and one relative constant, human nature. Situation may be defined as the dynamics of environment, and human nature seen as the basic urges or mainsprings of conduct—hunger, reproduction, and so forth.

Granted that children are nearly similar in their common humanity and their susceptibility to modification (other things being equal), what can be done to affect environmental situations so as to produce behavior that will not conflict with socially accepted forms? The most immediate obstacle is the deep significance of the emotional content of blood ties and home surroundings. Unless a child is removed from a particular environment at an extremely early age—and authorities differ as to what this age actually is, some even affirming that the moment of conception determines the affective relationships of the individual—he develops emotional attachments that are not likely to be broken by separation induced from without. The law recognizes this when it instructs the personnel of the court to *labor* with a family before taking action to cause a primary change in its makeup; social case work theory also agrees when it affirms the importance of the family as the unit of approach in all forms

of social therapy. The individual without attachment or basic group feeling of any sort is afloat on the sea of existence without chart or compass.

It is here that the court worker or social therapist must make a delicate decision. He must decide whether the removal of a child from a destructive home situation to a more wholesome and acceptable one will compensate for the loss of family attachment that is usually attendant to such a situation. The younger the child the more probable is the adjustment to a new home environment. Yet the danger is never quite eradicated that, in spite of an apparent emotional integration with the foster family group, a resurgence of blood feeling or original family attachment may break down the artificial structure and cause the ruin of a personality. Mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters are not interchangeable pawns in a game of social adjustment. No one with a sincere belief in the family as the basic unit of our social system will doubt me, I feel, when I say that if family ties have been severed, no matter with what desirable end in view, with what excellent and kindly foster family to receive the juvenile fragments of the broken home, something irreplaceable has been taken away from the life of each member, and what can be worked out or built up afterwards is at best a substitute for the real thing.

However, we are forced to recognize that in some cases this is unavoidable. And when it is so, realizing the profound seriousness of such a step, it behooves us to make sure that whatever substitute we do adopt for the dismembered family group is the most hopeful that can be found. I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the relative merits of boarding home and institutional care; both have their place in the scientific treatment of problem children. I will use as a premise, however, the conviction I hold that, with the possible exception of certain in-

stances where a behavior trend is already beyond the physical control of the agency dealing with the problem, foster home placement should be at least attempted before institutionalization is considered.

It has not infrequently occurred that when a particular child has been discussed as a possible subject for boarding home care, and the record of his delinquent behavior read off, we have been inclined to eliminate the possibility with the pronouncement, "He would never adjust in a boarding home." Now it would appear to me that this remark is seldom if ever justified before at least one placement has been tried. I fear we must admit that what we really meant to say is, "We have no boarding home available for dealing with a boy who presents a real challenge to those who are accustomed to meeting the less serious supervisional demands of the so-called dependent child." It is true that our resources at the present time are lacking in this respect, but I do not feel that the deficiency is impossible of correction. To make the necessary improvement involves a consideration to which I shall refer later.

Results of Boarding Home Care

Of more immediate importance is the question of result, or success in the use of boarding home care for children presenting behavior problems. What criterion can be adopted for measuring the efficacy of such a plan?

Is the absence of further antisocial conduct a sufficient standard? Mr. Bennet Mead, statistician for the United States Department of Justice, writing of the measure of probation success, says, "It should be emphasized that success is positive in its nature. Most people undoubtedly conceive of success as something far more vital than mere absence of failure. The sort of success that is no more than absence of failure becomes a pale shadow of success, a mediocre thing scarcely better than failure itself." Ex-

perience with boys in foster homes under court supervision establishes, to some extent, the validity of Mr. Mead's critique. It has sometimes been felt that boys in such situations are merely distracted or temporarily diverted from their delinquent trends by the influence of a new environment whose novelty will eventually wear off, and that no real gain has been made in spite of the absence of adverse reports concerning behavior.

The concept of the negative adjustment is, I am sure, familiar to all students of social case work. Upon its corollary, *positive adjustment*, we must concentrate our efforts to develop more valid standards of measurement. So far the principal advance along this line has been the establishment of uniform degrees of adjustment. Referring again to Mr. Mead's study we note his categories: striking improvement, moderate improvement, slight improvement, no improvement and so on. The obvious objection to this method of evaluation, namely, the factor of variability involved in the differing viewpoints and individual biases of those persons assessing the cases, can only be met by "collaboration of a number of professional groups, including experts in vocational guidance and education, psychologists, psychiatrists, doctors, and others" in addition to the probation officer or case worker who has primary responsibility and familiarity with the individual case, in arriving at a just and acceptable evaluation which may be compared scientifically to others of like nature.

From the point of view of the social theorist these considerations are paramount, but from the standpoint of an agency directly concerned with and administratively endowed with sole responsibility for the disposition of cases of delinquency reported to it, standards must perforce be accepted at a somewhat different level than that represented by the ultimate in evaluation theory. On this

basis it is difficult not to accept as some measure of success the absence of recidivism. True, frequently some constructive element, such as school progress, religious interest, identification with supervised group activity, is coincident with the absence of problem behavior. But here again it is necessary to take cognizance of the objection already stated: the probation officer's report cannot always be accepted as impartial and objective; furthermore, the period of time over which the estimate is made may be too short to permit of adequate evaluation.

Granted this crudeness of analytic resources, and allowing for the pressure of circumstances, it is not still probable that boarding home care can be adjudged to have yielded results at least worthy of further effort and study? Just as there is no absolute proof that any individual, no matter how fixed, ingrained, and persistent his antisocial trend has been in the past will *infallibly* commit additional offenses, so there is no weight of authority for the absolute validity of the negative adjustment concept. Practical disposition of cases and scientific theory must go hand in hand; we cannot wait until our sociologists give us the final answer. And unless we continue to experiment accepting as we go certain tentative conclusions that enable us to proceed further, is there any possibility of reaching even an approximation of definitive knowledge of the problem?

Results so far obtained are ambiguous and incomplete yet I cannot but feel that they offer real encouragement for the continuation and expansion of the foster care program. For example, instances can be cited where boys and girls whose conduct has made necessary their removal from home surroundings of a vicious or destructive character, have been placed in foster homes under proper supervision and subsequently returned to the homes from whence they came without any intervening amelioration

of the conditions and standards of the home; and yet they have shown, under long time observation, that the forces which once impelled them inevitably to delinquency no longer have the same effect. It is possible, of course, to explain such adjustments by the therapeutic effect of the mere passage of time; yet in some cases the redirection of interest, increased drive, and positive socialized behavior have been so marked that it is difficult not to give the foster home substantial credit for the change.

In Multnomah County our present resources are deficiently principally in one respect: finances. In the first place, experience has shown that a competent foster parent is not easily found; often it is necessary to select from groups of twenty or thirty applicants in order to secure one reliable home in which a child presenting a behavior problem may be placed. There is a body of opinion, I am aware, which opposes the profit motive in the foster care of children. It is true that persons are often found who are competent and willing to accept children in their homes for the bare expense of maintaining them. In the case of problem conduct, however, it seems only reasonable that the foster parent should receive remuneration for the extra patience, understanding, and diligence inherent in assuming responsibility for these children. From a broad point of view, it is desirable that in every instance of boarding home placement the control and supervision of a case work agency should be exercised; unless compensation exceeds mere cost of maintenance the agency is to some extent inhibited from such control. The foster parent is apt to feel, perhaps rightly, that when only necessities are provided, the responsibility for guidance and planned development of the child's personality belongs with him who makes the outlay of time and effort with no monetary compensation. I do not wish to convey the impression that the relationship should be strictly on

a business basis; that indeed would be far removed from the spirit of progressive child welfare theory. I merely wish to emphasize the necessity of adequate controlled resources in dealing with these problems. Social work on a quasi-charity basis is under a distinct handicap. I believe, in fact I know, that there are foster parents eminently well qualified to serve in this capacity, persons whose generosity of nature and sincerity of motive are beyond question, yet who would expect as a matter of course an equitable compensation for service rendered.

The distinction made in the statute between dependent and delinquent children may or may not be justified in the light of present day attitudes towards the problems these terms represent. There is a trend in some states, for example, California, toward a generalized approach; only one classification is used in the juvenile court law—that of juvenile ward. The courts in that state may dispose of the funds provided by the state for the care of these wards as they see fit, paying more or less for boarding care as the situation indicates. Without attempting to resolve the fundamental question implied by the distinction between delinquent and dependent in our Oregon statute and others like it, granting even that it is a desirable and necessary one, is it not logical that delinquents should be entitled to the same expenditure of public funds for scientific study and care as is allowed for their dependent brothers and sisters? From a purely practical standpoint even more care is justifiable for this group. Not only are they more difficult to adjust to conduct norms, but they represent a far greater potential menace to society than those in whose behavior antisocial tendencies have not been observed. Taking only the security of life and property into account, no ordinary amount seems too great if it can be expended with reasonable prospect of success, to deter, for example, some youth

from the commission of a crime of violence. It is well to remind ourselves that the purpose of all our courts, agencies and institutions is not only to prevent offenders from the repetition of their offenses, but to build into them the desire, the determination, and the ability to conform to socially acceptable standards. If then a resource can be developed which offers real promise toward this end, it is deserving of an opportunity.

Cases in Point

Robert is now nineteen years old. He has employment in a department store. His work has been somewhat intermittent due to economic conditions and ill health, but on the whole presents a creditable record for the past two years. Previous to this employment he served six months in the CCC, receiving an honorable discharge. He lives in the same apartment house into which his mother moved her family nine years ago, a district then as now noted for juvenile delinquency. Two of Robert's boyhood associates are now inmates of penitentiaries; one was sent to the State Training School and is now back, unemployed, in the neighborhood; others have pursued their separate careers into young manhood without serious involvement in social difficulties. Younger boys have taken their places as the problem children of the area. In short, the neighborhood is substantially what it was when Robert, age twelve, broke into a creamery plant bent on malicious mischief.

Robert's parents separated when he was quite small, the task of rearing and providing for three children devolving upon the mother alone. Leaving the East, she settled in Portland and obtained housework by the day in order to support the family. Robert's older sister, exposed to the temptations of urban life without parental supervision, rapidly became delinquent and was later committed to the state institution for delinquent girls. Robert, following a similar pattern and associating with a group of boys who, like himself, were mainly products of broken homes, went from mischief and petty theft to larceny, housebreaking and burglary. Summer camps, detention home treatment, the aid of Big Brothers and visiting teachers, all were tried without avail in a long attempt to arrest this boy's seriously developing delinquent trend.

Finally, when he had attained the age of fifteen, a boarding home placement was tried. Handicapped by poor home selec-

tion and health difficulties, the placement was of a very negative sort and was soon abandoned. Robert was temporarily recommitted to the detention home, when an elderly couple living on a lonely farm forty miles from the city applied to the court for a boy to help out with the work in return for his keep. Investigation revealed no serious objection to this home, although some misgiving was felt regarding the personalities of the boarding home parents; a certain lack of enthusiasm and joy of living did not augur too well for the happiness of an adolescent boy far from other associations.

But the experiment was made and it worked. Robert remained with this couple for a year, with no repetition of delinquency whatsoever. Occasional periods of defiance, laziness, or moodiness were observed but on the whole the boy's attitude improved steadily, and by the time his seventeenth birthday had arrived the court felt a new and hitherto unknown confidence in Robert's ability to avoid behavior difficulties. He had enrolled in the rural high school, was popular with school authorities, and was earning a small wage through NYA activity plus odd jobs about the neighborhood.

The transition effected by the CCC enrolment between the boarding home period and the reintegration with Robert's own family and neighborhood should no doubt be given some credit for the change wrought in the boy but surveying the history of the case from the perspective of time, we think it incontestable that the boarding home was the major factor in the rehabilitation of Robert. Especially significant is the fact that the boarding home which accomplished the change was far from meeting the best standards of a foster home placement.

Donald, thirteen, is the youngest boy of a family of seven children. None of the others, except the seventeen year old sister, have been conduct problems.

The father, never a good provider, a visionary, impractical, unstable dreamer (if not schemer), is described in the city directories and by the relief agencies as follows: in 1922 as a stock broker; in 1925 a geologist; in 1926 a traveling man; in 1927 a buyer; in 1929 "buying old gold"; in 1935 a lecturer; and now in 1938 he is "a chemical gardening promoter." He is also described by members of the family as a very brilliant man, an inventor, and by others as an educated fool. He is a non-provider who deserted his family in 1932.

The mother is described by social workers as a woman broken and discouraged over domestic and financial affairs, sensitive, unselfish, religious and loyal to the children and even to her

husband. The children are struggling in their poverty.

Donald first came to the attention of the court in 1935 at the age of ten, charged with truancy, theft from stores and bad companionship. From this time he developed steadily as a problem at home, in school, and in the community. His cool, defiant attitude impressed the school authorities who came to regard him as of the criminal type.

In the following year 1936 he was particularly active in stealing a railroad handcar, breaking and entering into stores and stealing merchandise therefrom, and in group activity ranging over considerable territory in southeast Portland, stealing and organizing and soliciting members for a "robber band." They had a hideout to which they would take their loot. To the police Donald exhibited a hard boiled attitude and roughly remarked "I suppose you will spring those juvenile officers on us" and then laughed.

For three months Donald was held in Frazer detention home and after his release for six months he apparently remained dormant. Then he broke out again with one of the old gang, burglarizing two stores. He was placed under the intensive supervision of a man probation officer and referred to the child guidance clinic. His attitude toward the court changed to one of friendliness and his progress has continued during the past year with but a relatively minor slump of truancy, bunking out a night or two, and stealing some milk from a porch.

But his dislike for school continued, and the opinion of the school authorities was unaltered. His mother was also apprehensive and the atmosphere at home was tense and depressed. Accordingly a private home placement was made for Donald in the country about the first of the year. His old school principal remarked it was an imposition and a menace to any family and community to place such a lad in their midst. But Donald has been responding in this foster home in a remarkable way. A real friendship has been established between the boy and his man teacher and principal. He is no problem to foster parents who are sympathetic and understanding. He has a paper route from which he earns \$2.50 a month. His relationship to his own family has been kept up by frequent visits and the telephone, and the boy is altogether happy. Had he remained at home and in the community, he would have been in serious difficulty by this time.

Leslie, who is now seventeen and will soon be eighteen, came to the attention of this court in 1935 when he was fifteen. The mother filed an informal report that he was beyond parental control, truant from school and untruthful.

This boy has a peculiar nervous affliction affecting his speech. Otherwise he is physically normal though possibly a little undersized.

The father of this boy was born of very wealthy parents in Wales. When he married the mother, a commoner, he was disowned by his family and they emigrated to the United States. The father who passed away in 1930 was a very high type of man intellectually.

The mother is a well-educated woman, highly emotional. She has consistently favored and protected this boy and at the time of the complaint had lost control of him. There were two other children—Betty, twenty-one, now attending a religious school in California, and Ronald, who would now be twenty years of age, but was drowned in Portland shortly after his father's death. This drowning was witnessed by Leslie who was unable to save his brother.

Leslie was placed on probation and at times was a very good boy and then again was very mischievous. On November 30, 1936, the police filed a report charging that this boy stole an auto but later abandoned it.

On December 1, 1936, the police charged him with stealing a bicycle. Leslie admitted his guilt and in a hearing before the judge was declared a delinquent ward of the court and committed to the Oregon State Training School, commitment being suspended pending good behavior. The family arranged for his enrolment in a very high priced boys' school. Everything went smoothly until early in January of 1938, when a call came from the school asking for a probation officer to visit. The investigation revealed that this boy in company with two or three others had broken into and burglarized some eighteen or twenty houses. The value of the stolen property was approximately \$2000. Leslie made a complete confession and most of the property was returned. The boy was taken to a psychiatrist for a complete examination and after several conferences it was decided that he should not be committed to an institution but should be given an opportunity in a home where boys were understood.

In March of this year such a home was found for this boy on a 180 acre ranch twelve miles from the nearest town. The owners of the ranch are in thorough sympathy with the rehabilitation of boys. The family are paying for his care.

The reports received by the probation officer are very encouraging. The boy has written several letters which indicate an adjustment. In these letters he speaks of the dogs, lambs, ponies and other animals on the farm. Of course it is a little early to predict the final outcome, but according to all indications this

has been a happy arrangement and the boy has been saved from institutional care.

Kenneth was first known to this court in the fall of 1929 as a persistent runaway, fifteen years of age. In April he was again referred to the court by his distressed parents, the father a prominent attorney in Portland and both he and his wife pillars of one of the downtown churches. This time it was revealed that the boy, having many attractive qualities, had been "crooked over small amounts of money for some time." His stealing dated back for at least a period of three years when he stole from the lockers of the Multnomah Club, and now the parents felt that a climax had been reached when he stole \$10 from the purse of his Sunday school teacher at a Christian Endeavor social. He had also been stealing from her and other friends previously and in addition he was very untruthful and disobedient.

In high school he was a flat failure, having failed in practically every subject. His parents feared that he was developing into a criminal and appealed to the judge who referred the case to a probation officer with the result that on May 2, 1930, he was placed in a ranch home in eastern Oregon. He remained on this ranch all during the spring and summer, returning home in the fall in time to attend school. He changed high schools and graduated with a creditable rating. He then obtained a dishwasher's job in a restaurant, working himself into a managership.


The effect of his placement in a private family was observed to be immediate and striking. It seemed to give him a perspective on himself. Frequent letters to his father and mother expressed appreciation and affection. They were amazed and delighted. After he returned home in the fall that attitude continued and has remained since. Only a few days ago the father spoke to the probation officer of the splendid character and attainments of the young man. It is largely attributable to a timely and superior foster home placement.

On November 13, 1937, the court ordered that Eugene be placed on a farm or in a country home through the Boys' and Girls' Aid Society, the court continuing supervision. Pending such placement he was to remain in Frazer detention home. Briefly the history of the case is as follows:

Eugene was a child of illegitimate parents, his father being unknown to the authorities when the mother was committed to the state hospital as a case of general paresis. The child was left in the care of his maternal grandparents whose resources were slender. The boy's delinquencies, dating from January 16, 1935, include thefts, truancy, fighting, bunking out, forgery, bicycle

theft and breaking and entering. The last offense occurred on October 8, 1936. After this the boy was placed in the detention home and under observation of the child guidance clinic. The result was an urgent recommendation that he be placed in an isolated country home. This procedure, the clinic workers believed, offered the only hope for his rehabilitation.

Accordingly, he was placed in a home in the country on March 25, 1937. Fifteen months have passed and there has been steady progress, marred only by relatively minor incidents such as the demolishing of a sign post and the breaking of school windows. Eugene completed the grammar school and a year in high school with credit. The psychiatrist was undoubtedly right when he stated that, if this boy were not placed, "he would end up with a noose around his neck." He may yet, but so far foster home placement offers the only promise and solution. It is likely that he will soon outgrow his isolated and simple foster home placement. The question now is to find a superior foster home in a more complex social environment.



Delinquent Boys in Foster Homes

CHARLES M. SCHERMERHORN

Probation Officer, Juvenile Court, San Francisco

THE placing of delinquent boys in foster homes has been a comparatively recent practice in the work of the San Francisco juvenile court. It began rather accidentally and experimentally. Some seven years ago when I was living in a small town near San Francisco I took two of these boys in whom I was especially interested into my own home as an experiment. I was curious to see if the kindly routine of a normal home would make any change in their general behavior patterns. One of the boys was guilty of only general misbehavior, but the other had been charged with quite serious offenses. Neither had a proper home. I found that the boys themselves were not bad, but had merely been responding in the only way they knew to the unwholesome situations in which they had been reared. They had had no training in normal living, but responded eagerly to teaching. They copied example and tried to live as my family lived and do as we did. In their own homes they had lived according to the example set them there. In my home they tried to do the same thing.

A neighbor came to know one of these boys in Sunday school and became so interested that she asked to take a boy who might profit by a good home. She had reared a son of her own and in these boys saw an opportunity for a new outlet for her abilities as a mother. She was no social worker nor expert in child welfare. However, it was realized that if a boy were placed with her as an experiment he at least would have a better home than he had

been accustomed to, and that having him in her home could do him no harm.

She was given a boy who had been a rather serious problem and was well on his way to becoming a more serious one. He was one of five brothers. The father was a rather harsh, ignorant man but devoted to his boys. He worked at night and slept in the day time. The mother was addicted to liquor and gambling and constantly having affairs with other men. She deserted the family periodically but her husband always took her back when she had nowhere else to go. This boy at the age of twelve had been before the court several times for petty thievery, truancy, running away from home, and turning in false fire alarms. He was supposed to be feeble-minded with an I. Q. of 55, and was termed a "non-reader." He was very small for his age but in robust health. All the boys had been placed in an orphanage by the father, but this boy had been expelled from the institution because of his nonconformity to routine, and his disturbing influence on other children.

As soon as the boy was placed he formed an immediate attachment for his foster mother. She gave him the nicest home he had ever had, with his own room where his personal belongings were inviolate. His shirts were clean and he was as nice appearing as any of the other boys. He sat at an attractive table with nice people and ate good food and new dishes. He was treated as if he belonged and not as a bad boy or an outcast. And being treated as a good boy, he immediately began attempts to be a good boy. From the day he went into the home the only complaints regarding his behavior were from the school. His transfer placed him in the second grade with the babies and he could not do even second grade work. This placed him at a great disadvantage and in conflict with his new-found sense of self-satisfaction. He tried to

compensate for this in ways that were not agreeable to the teacher nor approved of by the parents of some of the other children. However, his foster mother went to the school and helped fight his battles for him. This, too, was a new experience. She spent the hours after the evening dishes coaching patiently, going over and over the simplest words, sentences and problems. No one could tell her the boy was feeble-minded. He simply had never been given the proper start. The long results were that in the two years the boy was with her he went from the second through the sixth grade and made good marks in his subjects. He joined the Scouts and went to Sunday school regularly. He was as well behaved as any boy in the neighborhood. The foster mother was consistently strict and demanded implicit but not unreasonable obedience. The boy, for his part, held her in the highest esteem and realized the debt he owed her. The satisfaction the father received from the transformation in his boy cannot be expressed in words.

I cite this example because it was our first experiment and its success encouraged us. That first foster mother is still boarding delinquent boys for us and doing the same excellent work.

About this time a friend of mine who had a ranch nearby and who had done some work with boys, hearing me tell of this experience, requested the opportunity to take a couple of boys onto his ranch to help with the work and receive the benefits of a good home. This worked out well, and another farmer soon requested the same thing. From that beginning the work grew until today we have a constant load of 60 boys in foster homes and some 175 have passed through the program. As time went on techniques began to form, foster parents developed more skill and understanding, and in three or four years placement became an established practice. Being entirely an experi-

ment as far as San Francisco was concerned, there were no guarantees of results, and so during the first two or three years this work met with opposition and lack of interest. Blunders were made which always brought forth the "I told you so's." At first it was difficult to find homes of the proper standards willing to assume the responsibility. People were afraid of the boys. Those who did take them met with hostility and prejudice from their neighbors and from the schools. Whenever a boy caused trouble in the community the work got a distinct setback. It was only when the percentage of successes proved the value and the practicability of the procedure that it began to be accepted at face value in the court and in the communities where the boys were placed. In this process some communities were completely closed by the opposition. As has been stated, techniques and skills had not been developed and many blunders were made that caused a lot of trouble. We have found, finally, that the most successful communities for the foster home placements of delinquent boys are those which are comparatively isolated from large towns—the backwoods districts where there is much to occupy and interest, and where few temptations are presented.

What the Boy Needs

Gradually a philosophy of our foster home work has been developed, and it is perhaps the forming of this philosophy that has given a basis and foundation which has been partly responsible for whatever success has been achieved. It is understood, of course, that all these boys who have been placed have actually been taken into custody for some offense or other, and have consequently appeared before the juvenile court for a disposition of their cases. Our first concern for any boy who appears before the court is to try to make an adjustment in his native sur-

roundings. But occasions arise where these surroundings are so unwholesome that there can be no hope for normal adjustment and a removal from such environment appears imperative if anything salutary is to be accomplished with the boy. Moreover, subjectively these boys are totally unfitted to make a normal adjustment to society. Almost invariably any boy who is brought to the juvenile court comes from an abnormal home. Of 164 delinquent boys who have been placed in foster homes, 111, or 68 per cent came from broken homes; 10 per cent had no homes at all; and 12 per cent came from homes of a definitely low standard. Only 15 boys of 164 came from homes that might be called normal or decent.

It is a fact well known to social workers, but surprisingly not to the general public, that a boy who comes from such an abnormal home cannot easily form normal adjustments or perspectives. His view of life is distorted by his training. A boy who comes from a normal home is taught the little courtesies and conventions that make social contacts smooth. He learns to be at ease with people and in unfamiliar situations. He has a sense of security in his own home and knows that there are people vitally interested in his progress and welfare. When the boy from the normal home starts to school the principal and teacher are glad to see him and make him welcome. It is the same when he joins the Scouts or the Boys' Club, or goes to Sunday school. These agencies are designed for the normal boy.

But here is our boy from the juvenile court. He comes from a broken home or a home where there is drunkenness, immorality, cruelty, or just plain neglect. His folks have not had time nor interest for him. He has not been taught the niceties that make social contacts a pleasure and has had no one to really care about his development. The examples of behavior at home have been unwhole-

some, or he has been permitted to form unnatural habits which are a handicap. Consequently, when he starts to school at the age of six he acts as he has always acted, and before he has been in the schoolroom a week the teacher has him spotted. Before he has been in the school a month he is known as a problem child and he realizes that the school would be just as happy if he were not there. When he starts to Sunday school, if he does, he causes a disturbance and the teacher is relieved if he does not come back. If he wants to join the Scouts, or go to the Y. M. C. A., he does not know the proprieties and is either expelled or quits. It takes only a short while for him to realize that he is not wanted anywhere and that he is different. His whole configuration is growing in a field of insecurity and fear. He is shut off by the very deformity of his personality from everything that is good, and forced to occupy his time and energy with the only interests that are left which are generally unwholesome, and in company with other boys who also feel themselves outcasts. The result is mischief, more or less consistent and more or less serious. These boys are living and will continue to live in a world designed primarily for normal people. If they never learn the technique of adjusting to the general conditions in which they find themselves, they will gradually become enemies of society and suffer the consequences at the expense of society.

It is commonly said that Nature abhors a vacuum. It is just as much of a truth that any normal human personality abhors a feeling of inferiority or insecurity, and invariably resorts to the psychological devices of rationalization or compensation. Every human mind reacts to an intolerable situation in an individual fashion determined by the background of training and experience. So each of these boys reacts in his own way. Some become sullen and withdraw; some fight back and become antag-

onistic; some steal or have affairs with girls to establish a feeling of importance in their own minds. This is all classified as antisocial behavior, but the chances are that it should be classified rather as pro-individual behavior, at least from the standpoint of the boy. Such a boy hasn't a chance in society, not because he is opposed to society, but because society has never taught him the complexities of conformation, and he cannot learn them unless he is taught. So this boy comes to us bewildered, defiant, or cunning but really wanting more than anything else to be like other people and fill a role in society that will mean something.

The largest group of our boys fall between the ages of twelve and fifteen and the majority of them are charged with serious offenses. We take them out of their homes, out of their schools where they have been branded as bad, out of the environment where they are encouraged to be bad; and place them in new communities, in new schools, and in new homes where there are fathers and mothers who act like human beings, and who actually treat the boy as if *he* were a human being too, and expect him to act like one. Besides this important factor, there is work to be done in the new home, productive work that is part of the family program. The boy sees on the table the milk that he himself has drawn from the cow; vegetables that he has planted and cultivated; meat that he has helped to feed, kill, and dress; eggs from the chickens he has cared for. He works with animals and realizes their dependence on man. In addition to this he has wholesome recreation provided by country life: swimming, fishing, hunting, exploring and roaming the countryside. There are few, if any, picture shows with their artificial stimulation. Adventure and experience can be actual and personal, not merely vicarious.

Selecting Homes

Perhaps it is time to get down to more practical angles of this work. In the first place a few words regarding the type of home which we use and the standards which we require. In placing a delinquent boy we cannot merely dispose of him in a home that is somewhat better than his own, just to get rid of him for a while, or to remove him from circulation, so to speak. Nor can we put him away as punishment for what he has done. Our main concern is to find the particular home where the boy in question will make the best adjustment. The placing agent, therefore, must be familiar to some extent with the personality, background, likes and dislikes of the boys to be placed in order to find a home that will be as congenial as possible and at the same time beneficial. Toward that end the placing agent must also be familiar with the personalities, environment, and equipment of the various possible foster homes.

In investigating a home I take the personalities in the home more into account than I do the physical equipment. Most of our boys have been accustomed to few luxuries, 69 per cent of them coming from homes that depend on a hand to mouth existence. But personalities in the prospective home are of extreme importance. Harsh discipline is rarely necessary; much more useful is a good sense of humor. Most of the homes I am now using have proved themselves over a period of time. Some are well recommended by local licensing agencies but may not do at all for our boys. The man or his wife may not have the patience or skill that it takes to handle a problem boy. Many people are afraid—afraid of the boys and afraid of the opinion of their neighbors. Just recently a farmer and his wife told me in all seriousness that they would never take juvenile court boys because they might wake up some morning to find their house burned down or to

find themselves murdered. They had read about such things in the papers. On the other hand, foster parents tell me they would rather board boys from the court than any others because they are easier to handle and more appreciative of what is done for them.

It might be supposed that it would be difficult to find proper homes for the boys. At first it was not so easy, but in the last three or four years we have had all the homes we needed and have been able to make a selection of the better ones. I have never yet gone out looking for homes or advertising for them. If the prospective foster parents come to me and ask me to give them a boy, that places them under obligation to me. If I ask them to take a boy it is the other way round and there is a big difference in perspective. For a while we attempted to utilize only those homes within a fifty mile radius of San Francisco, but we soon abandoned that practice for several reasons—the boys were too close to large centers of population with their temptations, it was too easy for them to run away when things did not go to suit them, and it was too convenient for their folks to see them. We find that it is usually not satisfactory to have the parents visit too often as a visit is apt to bring up old associations which we are trying to break. If a boy is able to remain away from his parents until he has acquired more or less self-sufficiency, the cure is much more apt to be permanent. We find that the isolated homes, comparatively removed from the centers of population, are much better for our boys. The more it is possible for a boy to break with all former associations which aggravated his trouble, the more sure and rapid is the cure. It is difficult to effect a recovery from a moral as well as a physical malady if the patient remains in contact with the sources of infection.

It has been found unsatisfactory to have any great number of boys in the same community. They may get

together and reinfect each other, to revert to medical phraseology. Besides this, where there are several in the same neighborhood the local residents and the schools usually object.

Supervision

Another important factor in this work is the constant supervision of the boys and the foster homes by the court. With the sixty boys I now have under placement I am on the road most of the time. During the month of May I drove over 3500 miles. Neither the boys nor the foster parents know when I am coming. On every trip there is advice to be given, and difficulties to be ironed out. One boy needs medical or dental attention, another needs clothes, perhaps the boy is in one of his moods, perhaps he has had a letter from home that upset him. When I read some of the letters parents write I can understand why the boy went haywire. Many times the boy has to be set right in his thinking as to his relationship to the foster parents or the court. By making it a practice to visit all the homes more or less regularly I can see for myself what progress the boys are making in home or school adjustments, and in physical and personality improvement. Sometimes there are community misunderstandings to adjust. Then, too, the boys realize that they have not been placed merely to be put out of the way and forgotten. The foster parents take pride in having me notice and remark on how well the boys are doing and how pleased we all are with the good work they have done. This challenges the foster parents to make continued and renewed efforts to help the boys.

As to financial arrangements, the usual terms are that the county or the parents will pay \$20 per month for maintenance, and in addition furnish clothes and incidentals, and be responsible for any emergency medical

attention. The boy is expected to help with the work. This last is very important for the boy's own good, for it is surprising how many eighteen year old boys in cities have never done a day's real work in their lives. Moreover work helps the boy to feel that he is important in the family.

One of the great problems of a foster home program is overcoming prejudice. In this I find that getting acquainted in the communities where the boys are placed is a great help. I make a point of talking to people wherever I stop—in service stations, restaurants, auto courts, to road supervisors, school teachers, judges, sheriffs, in fact to anyone who is interested and will listen. And almost everyone is interested and willing to cooperate. I do make it a practice to definitely remove any boy from the community where he is placed if he causes any serious trouble. I also make it a policy not to go near any of the local schools where boys are placed. I have been criticized for this but I have found almost always that if the teachers or the principal know the boy is from the court it is too much of a temptation to throw it up to him or hold the threat of reform school over his head if he causes any sort of disturbance. I leave all school arrangements to be made by the foster parents. I want my boys to go into the schools on a par with every other child, and as if the foster parents were his own. On occasion I have kept a boy out of school for six months or a year when school seemed to be one of the main sources of irritation. The most important thing is for the boy to become adjusted emotionally, and school at the particular time may be only incidental.

Studying Results

In order to realize just what is happening in my foster homes I have tried for several years to keep as accurate

statistics as possible, and every six months I tabulate these. From these statistics I have made a number of studies in which I tried to be as fair and impartial as possible. Some of the figures are not so encouraging as I should have liked them to be. I hope you will be able to bear with me for a few moments while I give you what I consider to be the most significant conclusions from these studies. You have already been given some indication of the type of boys we have placed in our foster homes. We have seen that 90 per cent of these boys come from broken, inadequate, or unfit homes. Breaking this down: of the 164 boys placed, 104 or 63 per cent had no father in the home. Of the 60 fathers who were in the homes, 15 were drunkards, 25 were unemployed, and 6 were incapacitated. Of the 60 only 18 could be considered good fathers. Forty of the 164 boys, or 25 per cent, had no mother in the home. Of the 124 mothers who were in the homes 14 were drunkards and 28 were openly immoral. Seventy-two could be considered good mothers but 50 were employed at least part time out of the home. In summation: only 18 of the 164 boys had fit fathers in the home and 72 had good mothers. Only 34 of the boys had both parents in the home and of these, 14 fathers and 8 mothers were considered unfit. So only 12, or 7 per cent, came from homes with a dependable father and mother both. Financially, in 69 per cent of the homes the earnings of the breadwinners were not enough to meet the needs of the family. Slightly more than one third of the boys came from homes where there were three or more brothers and sisters.

So much for the families. Now as to the boys themselves: 71 per cent came before the court for such serious offenses as burglary, auto theft, petty theft, sex offenses or robbery. Psychologically, 47 per cent of the boys were

listed as having intelligence quotients below 90, and 53 per cent above 90.

Perhaps you are interested in the number of replacements we have to make: of the 108 boys who have been through the program and are no longer in foster homes, 56 per cent were in only one home, and with only 20 per cent was it necessary to place them in more than two homes. These figures include those beginning years when many mistakes were made in placement and homes were hard to find. Of the 56 boys who are now in foster homes only 10 per cent have been in more than two homes. As to the length of time the boys stay in the home, again considering the 108 boys who have been through the program, 22 per cent were kept less than six months, 27 per cent from six months to a year, 30 per cent from one to two years, and 15 per cent from two to three years. It sums up to 50 per cent of the boys remaining less than a year and 50 per cent more than a year.

Of the boys who have been removed from foster homes and placed back into society, 68 per cent have continued to make a good adjustment. Twenty of these boys have finally landed in a state school. These we class as our failures, but many of them were pretty far gone when we were asked to place them. Just as a matter of interest I made a special study of these twenty boys and found that not one came from a home that could be called decent.

The figures I have kept tend to prove more and more conclusively that the boys who have a hard time adjusting are the boys from the poorer homes. I have made a statistical comparison of the two groups, those who have made a good adjustment and those who have had difficulty. Of the 108 boys who had been through the program, 68 made a good adjustment in the foster home and 40 made a poor adjustment. Of the boys who made a good adjustment 63 per cent had fathers or stepfathers

in the home, while of those who failed to adjust only 40 per cent had fathers. This is even more significant when we see that the figures as to broken homes and mothers in the home are about the same for both groups. Apparently Dad means something.

Of the group of boys who failed, 73 per cent of the homes were on the poverty level, while of the group who made good 60 per cent were on this level. Half of the boys who failed in foster homes failed to make good after their removal, while only 11 per cent of the boys who made good in foster homes failed on removal. Perhaps the surprising thing should be that even half of the boys who failed in foster homes made good after they were removed.

The most important indication of all is that of the 164 boys who have been placed 74 per cent have done well in the foster home. This figure includes those beginning years when many mistakes were made in placement, when homes were hard to find, and when the program, standards, and techniques had not been established. Of the forty-two boys who failed to make an adjustment, only twelve have been placed in the last two and one-half years.

It is interesting to watch the rapidity of development of some of the boys when they are placed in a wholesome atmosphere. Perhaps always before they have been denied proper nourishment, both physical and spiritual, essential for the healthy and natural growth of personality, and have become dwarfed and malformed in character. They are bewildered or frightened and express themselves in unnatural ways. But when they are given an opportunity in wholesome surroundings the eagerness with which they respond is a joy to anyone who knows them.

Work such as this has to be performed with intelligence and requires constant and consistent supervision. The

placing agent is the one factor providing continuity for the boy's unwholesome past, his period of readaptation to normal life and society, and his placement in that society on his own responsibility as a normal human being. The work requires never-ending patience, and an unshakable faith in the ultimate worth of personality.

VII THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE GROUP



The Use of Group Activity in Probation Work

KENNETH I. WOLLAN

*Director, Citizenship Training Department
Juvenile Court, Boston, Massachusetts*

PROBATION has relied upon the inspiration and findings of allied fields. Its development has been determined by the contribution and collaboration of related techniques.

If it had existed in any systematic form during the time of Lombroso, it probably would have been under the domination of his school of thought, and probation efforts would have been confined to those individuals who were free from the telltale stigmata of criminality.

If Durkheim's philosophy of social determinism had been popular during the early days of probation, we probably should have seen a greater emphasis upon social forces and social control in our entire probation development.

As it turned out, probation was seeking a scientific ally at about the time that the mental hygiene movement was getting under way and at a time when psychiatric techniques were showing promising signs of growth. The mental hygiene movement was attempting to remove the stigma commonly placed upon insanity and in doing this called attention to the pathological character of much human behavior hitherto deemed completely normal. Psy-

chiatry began to investigate what had been observed for hundreds of years, the fact that many criminals possess mental abnormalities. The common deduction which grew out of all this was the assumption that basically crime is a problem of mental abnormality, and delinquents and criminals constitute a class whose problem is essentially pathological.

In following this development I was interested in seeing what certain professional journals made of this issue, and went back twenty years or more in the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, the *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *Mental Hygiene*, and the Yearbooks of the National Probation Association. One notices the steady stream of articles dealing with crime and psychopathology which have come into our literature and dominated our thinking.

In 1917 Bernard Glueck published a memorable study in which he found that 59 per cent of a group of 608 inmates of Sing Sing Prison were mentally diseased, mentally defective, or psychopathic personalities.

Twelve years later a startling study was completed by the psychiatrists of the Illinois Reformatory at Pontiac. During the years 1919-1929 they found that 99.5 per cent of the incoming inmates were afflicted with some type of mental pathology. Only four tenths of one per cent were free from abnormality.

I think all of us might well have stood breathless before such findings. If they were true, we could make the quick conclusion that crime is a matter of psychopathology and something to be handed over to those who treat mental abnormalities. We have learned, however, that the problem is not so simple as that, for out of the field of psychiatry itself has come a tempering hand which called a halt to the extreme findings of those years following Bernard Glueck's first startling study at Sing Sing.

The first flush of enthusiasm for the clinic as the pana-

cea for our crime problem wore itself away. Recently Dr. James Plant, speaking on the clinic in relation to the juvenile court, said: "It should study only a fraction of the children coming before the court. There are at least three reasons for this and they are worth enumerating because of the feeling in some cities that the court should have every child coming before it examined in the clinic. These reasons are: (1) Any routine measure is bad. No human being has reached that stage of perfection which allows him an adequate freshness of spirit to attack problems which lack some element of special appeal. (2) A large number of children's cases should not be given the importance of a clinic examination. One of the outstanding defects of the modern juvenile court is that it reaches into certain minor conduct disorders that are better forgotten. . . . (3) Judges practice a more or less efficient kind of psychiatry and frequently make quite as adequate an analysis of the situation as the clinic. Psychiatry is not a magic wand to be waved by a trained handful. It is as widely practiced as human thought with the result that there is as much poor psychiatry as careless thinking."¹

More recently Dr. Charles B. Thompson found after examining 9256 persons in the Court of General Sessions, New York City, that only 1.4 per cent were psychotic, only 2.4 per cent were mentally defective, and only 5 per cent fell into the category of psychopathic personalities. His comment in the light of these findings is this: "It is gradually becoming evident that if we are to understand the causations of crime we must discard the conventional psychiatric approach which studies patients or prisoners as individuals who present symptoms and who are somehow of a different fiber from ourselves. There is indicated the need for an entirely new approach which will include

1. Plant, James S., "The Psychiatric Clinic and the Juvenile Court" (*Yearbook of the National Probation Association*, 1929, pp. 195-196).

all of us who constitute society and not merely those individuals who become involved with the law."¹

Utilizing Group Activity

It is because of this clearer perspective of the last few years that we have come to see group activity as a promising ally to psychiatry and its related fields. We certainly do not offer it as a panacea or even as something new. We do see it, however, as one of the most normal and promising directions in which our whole treatment program may move.

A reasonable use of group work in treatment procedure does not involve an abandonment of clinical techniques; rather, it presupposes an intimate working relation with them. It must be built upon them and geared into them. Group activity and group techniques are to be evaluated in the light of accepted values found in clinical practice. As testimony to our working relation to the more formal clinical side of treatment it may be pointed out that in our Citizenship Training Department in the Boston Juvenile Court, which makes broad use of group activity, we have on our staff a psychiatrist and a consulting psychologist. We look to the group as an additional resource in probation procedure to be placed side by side with individualistic clinical techniques, thus providing a more normal and a more adequate approach to the study and treatment of problem children. The case record, the medical and psychological examinations, and the interview are all retained as indispensable items in our study of personality, but in addition the individual is submitted to a number of social experiences by way of group activity before his problem is formulated and treatment terminated. Personality in its broadest sense is a person's habitual re-

1. Thompson, Charles B., "Some New Aspects of the Approach to Crime" (*Mental Hygiene*, Oct. 1936, p. 14).

sponse to social situations. As such it seems reasonable to conclude that we can really never know or never alter a personality unless we submit it to the strain and discipline of living and playing with other persons.

The Nature of Delinquency

The term delinquency is not easy to define. A study of the specific offenses charged against the delinquent does not give one a very clear lead to a formulation of the problem, for terminology varies from court to court and frequently one type of offense is charged against a child while the real problem is something entirely different. When we take a long range view of the field of delinquency, two significant causes emerge, each of which accounts for a certain cross-section of those who get into our juvenile courts.

1. *Delinquency as Social Immaturity* Regardless of the charge or our own particular point of view, one conclusion is inevitable: a boy comes into court because he cannot get along with other people, because he cannot live successfully with others in those groups in which he finds himself. Specifically, the social side of this individual has not been developed to the point where he has learned to control his own personal impulses in the interest of happy group life. This has recently been pointed out in a study by Dr. Fred Brown in Minneapolis. In three carefully selected groups of delinquents, proto-delinquents, and nondelinquents, he found the developmental age of the nondelinquents in advance of both of the other groups, clearly indicating a more infantile social behavior on the part of those boys who come into the court.¹

When we take this view of the problem, we come to look upon the delinquent as one who is essentially imma-

1. Brown, Fred, "Social Maturity and Stability of Non-delinquents, Proto-delinquents, and Delinquents" (*American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, April 1938, pp. 214-219).

ture in his social relationships. Growing up is not merely a physical phenomenon. It includes the maturing of the social side of the individual. It calls for an inhibiting of the self-centered, primitive, aggressive nature of the child. Not until the boy learns to find a place for other persons' wishes and interests, not until he matures to the point where he can act responsibly within the frame work of his own family, school, and community groups, can we call him civilized and socialized. If this is true, a new emphasis in our whole treatment program is called for. We shall come to look upon him not as sick or injured, but as underdeveloped and immature. In attacking the problem from long range we shall first of all go back into our communities and social groups to determine why certain individuals have not been brought up under wholesome, civilizing conditions. In the immediate attack upon the boy who presents himself to our courts, we shall add to the individual case worker's supervision, specific group experiences and group training with the hope of developing in him those attitudes and habits of maturity which will permit him to live successfully with other persons in his own family, school and community groups.

To Frankwood E. Williams' two evidences of maturation of personality, the development of independence, and the attainment of normal heterosexuality, Kimball Young adds a third, the ability to take responsibility. In commenting on how to achieve this he says: "There are various degrees or areas of maturity and responsibility. The individual develops these qualities only in response to social demands and the influence of other people upon him. We remain impulsive, emotional, unstable, given to fear, anger, or uncontrolled affection, unless we have been trained otherwise."¹

S. R. Slavson strikingly summarizes the value of group

1. Young, Kimball, "Freedom, Responsibility and Self-Control" (*Mental Hygiene*, April 1937).

activity in developing maturity: "There are numerous boys who lack the most essential patterns of behavior in a group relation: they do not possess elementary cultural tools for group life. These are boys and girls who have not acquired even rudimentary inhibitions. They hardly take cognizance of the needs and convenience of others. These young people have to be reeducated. They must learn the simplest concepts and practices of human relationships. They have to be made into civilized persons. Group experience with a purpose and wholehearted interest is perhaps the most certain method of reaching such individuals, for they learn by experience rather than through abstract teaching. The group must, therefore, supply face-to-face contacts in an informal relation where conflicts, hostilities, friendships, and cooperation can occur and find expression; for it is well known that personality is modified through interaction and first-hand experience."¹

An essential goal of our probation work is, therefore, to help our boys and girls develop a growing capacity for taking responsibility and to assist them in achieving a social maturity which will permit them to be successful, happy members in their homes, schools, and communities. To develop this skill in group living, we can reasonably look to planned group activity as one of the most promising treatment aids to be added to our present resources.

2. *Delinquency as an Expression of Frustration and Mental Conflict* Out of intensive study of the individual delinquent by the psychiatrist has come a discovery of the emotional background out of which delinquency grows. In certain cases it has been found that delinquent behavior breaks out as an expression of frustration and mental conflict. The individual does not know why he commits certain acts because he is motivated by unconscious wishes

1. Slavson, S. R., *Creative Group Education* (New York: Association Press, 1937).

and desires over which conscious control seems to be lacking. This point of view was first pronounced by Dr. William Healy in his book *Mental Conflict and Misconduct*.¹ It has been substantiated in his subsequent publications and in the work of August Aichhorn. In a recent volume Dr. Healy and Dr. Bronner state: "Indeed a striking finding of our present study has been an immense amount of discoverable emotional discomfort that clearly has been part of the story of the origin of delinquency."²

If then we are in certain cases dealing with boys and girls who are fundamentally unhappy, frustrated, and seeking some of the common satisfactions of life, we can hopefully look to group activity as a promising treatment medium for providing appreciation, recognition, and those simple satisfactions which have been denied the offenders. We can moreover look to group activity, if widely applied, as a promising preventive in supplying that enrichment of life, the absence of which is causing delinquent behavior.

A Supplementary Influence to the Clinical Approach

Group activity as a treatment aid in probation depends upon an alliance with clinical psychology, education, medicine, and social case work. Specifically, group work must find its place as a powerful ally to the individualistic, clinical approach. It has, therefore, been our task to study the manner in which group activity supplements the finding of the clinical approach and to determine the best way in which to use this natural union.

First of all let's be practical. Straight clinical psychiatric treatment is much too expensive for a thorough application to probation. There simply is not enough money

1. Healy, William, *Mental Conflict and Misconduct* (Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1917).

2. Healy, William; Bronner, Augusta F., *New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936).

in state or private funds to underwrite the terrific budgets that would be necessary for extensive individual service. Even if delinquency were a medical problem, which in the majority of cases it is not, the cost would make its use prohibitive. If we consider a case load of fifty probationers per year as the maximum for good psychotherapeutic treatment, in the State of Massachusetts which has an average of about 30,000 probationers per year, the annual payroll for therapists alone would reach at least several millions of dollars even if all of the probationers were not treated. This does not include the building facilities, equipment, psychologists, social workers, janitors, stenographers, etc., necessary for carrying out treatment of this type. Certainly the entire cost might easily reach four or five million dollars. We may well ask ourselves what chance an item like this would have in our state budget.

But we find hundreds of group organizations in our communities which may be educated and trained to do more intensive work with boys and girls who get into court. In Boston the city-wide conference of boys' workers has pledged itself to assist boys who come out of the Citizenship Training Department of the court. During the last winter this conference has provided a worker whose main duties have been to assist the club leader in placing, counseling, and supervising the individual delinquent in his club activities. The entire Citizenship Training Department of the court has been set up and housed in a group work organization with practically no cost aside from salaries. Several settlements in our Roxbury Neighborhood Council have set up trial treatment groups in their present quarters without additional expense.

The issue is clear. If for no other reason than cost, we need to recognize that some alliance with the group work field is necessary. Sheldon Glueck has commented

upon this need in the following way: ". . . every one of the historic devices for coping with criminality has been established without sufficient regard to its relationship to and dependence upon existing institutions. Yet, however promising any crime treatment may be, it cannot successfully function *in vacuo*. It runs the danger of many of its efforts coming to naught, if it is not organically related to those institutions on which the community has already pinned its faith. Merely to add one more device to those already functioning without carefully planning its relationship to existing institutions, will not bring desirable results."¹

An intensive psychiatric approach which depends upon the development of insight in the delinquent is not applicable to persons of all levels of intelligence. It is an acknowledged fact that one must have at least average or above average intelligence to profit from psychiatric treatment. It becomes clear, then, that the majority of our delinquent and criminal population are not promising prospects for such treatment. Dr. Walter Bromberg, in reporting on the intelligence level of 458 adolescent delinquents, found that 48 per cent were below average. In a group of 537 adolescent recidivists (a group that especially needs care) he found that 55 per cent were below average. In another group of 3392 adult offenders, Dr. Bromberg discovered that 44 per cent had less than average intelligence.²

If to that large group of delinquents and criminals excluded from clinical treatment because of limited intelligence we add those who are too resistive to respond to this approach, we have eliminated the majority of offenders.

However, even borderline defectives make a fair ad-

1. Glueck, Sheldon, *Probation and Criminal Justice* (New York: Macmillan, 1933).

2. Bromberg, Walter, "A Psychiatric Study of Adolescent Offenders" (*Yearbook of the National Probation Association*, 1935, pp. 80-81).

justment in groups which are adapted to their capacities. In athletics, in craft work, in games, this mental level does have its place. Habit training experience in group living can be taught on the level which is suited to limited intelligence. We have been astonished to find dull boys making a satisfactory adjustment where academic work has been at a minimum, even in groups of average boys. If the intellectual level of each individual is determined, the activities of a group may accommodate all mental levels.

Informal group relations develop treatment rapport spontaneously. When the boy comes into our Citizenship Training Department he is asked no questions but is given group activity in which even the leaders participate. He is generally made to feel that this does not have the investigative aspect of the court. A medical examination is accepted as a necessary preliminary for gymnasium privileges. The boy finds it normal to establish rapport with a leader who plays basketball with him. He certainly finds it natural to talk about physical matters with one who enjoys and participates in physical activity with him. This offers the entering wedge for a discussion on the more profound problems of personality and conduct.

Introducing group activity into the treatment situation offers an opportunity to enhance the use of the interview. It can be timed to good advantage. It need not be used until the therapist and the boy have a certain number of mutual experiences upon which to build confidence. In other words, rapport in the interview does not depend upon the interview but upon demonstrable fair play and mutual experience in the group. One goes into the interview *with* rapport instead of depending upon the interview to produce this. Aside from this consideration of timing, the interview has additional value as a treatment aid because situations which illustrate personality problems can

be brought up for discussion between the therapist and the boy at the time of their appearance.

Practice is an essential condition of achieving any skill. We accept this as dogma in most areas. We certainly should hold out little hope for the musical skill of any boy who refused to practice his lessons. We likewise know what happens to the football or baseball player who does not train. It is a strange quirk of logic which permits us to believe that boys and girls whose fundamental problem is their inability to live successfully with other people, can achieve this skill without intensive training and practice in that particular area. Respect for others is learned by living under conditions which demand practicing respect for others. Trustworthiness in dealing with other people's property is developed under conditions which demand care and consideration for that which does not belong to us. Experience would seem to tell us that we can't talk a boy into this. We can't analyze him into this. Our only chance of achieving this is through controlled experience which, we believe, can be effectively provided in the group, except in those cases where the emotional problem is sufficiently severe to demand intensive analysis and individual care.

In the clinical approach, however much you talk over certain modifications in personality, there is rarely opportunity to put these insights into effect. Unless there is positive opportunity to practice these modifications, treatment may not go beyond the academic stage. If group treatment is added to the clinical resources, the modifications which are talked over in the interview can be transposed into behavior patterns by actual practice and experience. Attitudes can be translated into habits.

In the usual clinic setup, do we not run the risk of over-emphasizing the importance of an individual as an individual, particularly in the great mass of cases which are

caused by poor training and environment rather than conflict? In commenting on one of the common characteristics of human development, an extreme form of which is found among recidivists, Dr. Charles B. Thompson says: "By virtue of the image of himself which is thus secondarily acquired by the individual, and which differentiates him competitively from all others of his kind, an overemphasis is put upon the individual and in turn he is given an exaggerated sense of his own importance. He feels, though he naturally has no clear perspective on it, that his health or his ills, his likes and his dislikes, his gains or his losses, are many times more important than those of his neighbor."¹

The general run of our delinquents are problems because they have never properly evaluated themselves in the light of other people. They do not have a perspective of their own importance in our whole social scheme. When boys of this type come into court and we throw all our clinical resources into high gear, they simply love the incident. This procedure frequently serves to accentuate their preoccupation with self and makes them overvalue their own importance still more because they have now a whole clinic fussing over them. The boy is overweighted as an individual and underweighted as merely one person in a large world of people.

When group activity is coordinated with the clinical approach the individual may hope to gain a fundamental insight into his relative importance in the social scheme. In the group he is merely one of many. He receives the same treatment as the rest of the boys, unless he shows need for special remedial measures. He has an opportunity to make a proper evaluation of himself as an individual and thereby begin to learn to live with other persons unobtrusively.

¹ Thompson, Charles B., "A Psychiatric Study of Recidivists" (*American Journal of Psychiatry*, Nov. 1937, p. 601).

There is a growing feeling among psychologists and psychiatrists that from a diagnostic point of view, the traditional clinical approach relies too heavily upon subjective information. To be sure, it calls for a medical examination and psychological tests, but it lacks an opportunity to objectively observe the patient's response to others in a variety of social situations. We have specified one type of delinquency as primarily a lack of maturity in a boy's relationships to others. To diagnose such a disturbance without observing these relationships is about as hazardous as saying a fellow is a poor ball player without ever having seen him perform.

Adding the group to clinical resources offers a corrective for this. The therapist can be around the group or in it, and he can see precisely at what point the social nature of a boy needs development. What this does is to add objectively to the study of a boy's problem something we demand in every sound scientific procedure.

A Demonstration of Group Activity in Probation

In Boston there has been in operation for two and a half years a department of the juvenile court, supported by private funds, which has been working on a plan of probation which utilizes both clinical and group techniques. Our Citizenship Training Department accepts all boys between the ages of twelve and seventeen who are on probation in the juvenile court, and for a period of seven weeks, two hours a day, exposes the probationer to the routine of a medical examination, psychological tests, observation, and a general personality study, relying upon carefully planned group activity to make the experience natural, acceptable, and profitable to the boy. All the relationships of the department, which is known by the boys as the Citizenship Training Group, are kept on

an informal basis to facilitate the personality study and to establish a useful relationship for our therapeutic efforts.

While this diagnostic effort is being made, the normal processes of group activity are utilized in an informal way to make a definite effort to modify attitudes of antagonism and resentment which may be standing in the way of the boy's rehabilitation. From the treatment side, we cannot hope to eradicate immediately long established life patterns of behavior, but during the seven weeks we have found it possible to modify attitudes which hinder a healthy community adjustment. We do attempt in a preliminary way to initiate healthful social and personal habits by a special training program which includes the discipline of personal hygiene, working together, playing together, and discussing cooperatively problems of citizenship.

Our headquarters are located about one mile from the court in an athletic union. There is no stigma attached to attendance at this union, rather the boys look upon it favorably as a well-known center for the practice of athletics.

At the conclusion of the seven weeks training, the medical examination, social history, psychological study, observations, physical measurements, and personality tests are reviewed by the staff of the department and the probation officer, and a specific plan of probation is worked out for the boy. At this time the long term treatment program is agreed upon and set into effect. We now turn the boy over to that agency in the city which is best qualified to carry out this program. For this step we have working agreements with psychiatric clinics, medical dispensaries and hospitals, placement agencies, religious organizations, recreational and club centers. The City Wide Boys Workers' Conference has backed a club plan for

those boys who need the influence of this type of activity. A follow-up worker on the staff of the Citizenship Training Department and the probation officers check frequently with the cooperating agency to determine the effectiveness of the probation plan which is in operation.

During the summer months the entire department is moved to a day camp fifteen miles outside the city. Here the regular program and routine is carried on with an elaboration of those elements which seem to have special treatment value.

This is briefly the way in which we have attempted to make a working alliance between clinical and group methods. It is intended to be a more natural and normal way of dealing with probationers, using what is effective from all the allied fields. When we speak about the value of group activity we are clear in our minds that we do not mean mass activity. The groups must be small enough to insure individual care and to make individual relationships within the group important, effective, and revealing. The ultimate value of what we are doing will directly depend upon the flexibility of our plan. There is no one cure. We must use the best tools at our disposal; we must be geared into the existing resources of the community; and then we must do that which is most difficult of all—the right thing at the right time.



Recreation as Crime Prevention

GLEN O. GRANT

Western Representative, National Recreation Association

WITH the subject "Recreation as Crime Prevention" I should like, by way of introduction, to suggest as the central theme for my presentation, twentieth century living, a challenge to youth and a charge against society. Most of us here have done the major part of our living in the twentieth century but we may well ask ourselves pointedly, "Has our living been adequate to the twentieth century setting and opportunity?" The old always carries through into the new, and it rightfully should. The trek of civilization upward towards the heights can only be brought about by building upon the best of the past for a better today and a yet brighter tomorrow. Much of our twentieth century living has been built upon a nineteenth century standard of success. In that yesterday, the attention of the American people was placed largely upon reaching a success built upon monetary and material acquisition while a new continent was yet to be more fully explored and its resources claimed.

Contemporary of the Indian, the buffalo, and the lure of the gold rush in the western mountains, Horace Greeley pointed the way to seeming success for that day when he said, "Go west, young man, go west." To a very marked degree those challenging frontiers have been conquered and today we face new frontiers. These are great days in which we live—days of tremendous change in the social and economic world. You and I have seen the automobile, the airplane, the radio come into common use in our short span of life. These great inventions are only the fore-

runners of others to come. Our generation has not yet conquered these new tools. It remains for our youth, on the foundations which we have built, to move out across the horizons to new frontiers, to build a better American life and culture than we have as yet been able to achieve.

Howard Braucher, secretary of the National Recreation Association, aptly expresses this challenge when he says:

Perhaps Americans do have more automobiles, more bathtubs, more radios, more pianos, more barns, more and bigger factories than other people on the world's surface. Perhaps we do have more gold.

That, however, is not our American dream.

What is desired above all else is not something external—something to be worn, something to be eaten, some tool. What is really sought is inner power, inner capacity, the building of persons who can do things, who can go places, the building of immortal souls, the building of life that has enough to it to be worthy of being eternal.

Early we discover that beauty does not perish, that the memory of beauty remains with us; that sports with others satisfy something deep, give us something to dream over later; that comradeship in activity builds warm feelings within, kindles fires that go on burning, that seem to make wheels go round inside us, give us a reason for going on, transform the bare, the barren, the cold into the rich, the warm, the colorful.

The American way of life on the surface may sometimes have seemed to wander up and down and around, but underneath it has always on the long haul moved toward beauty, music, sport, richness in living, church spires, school bells, art galleries, parks, playgrounds, swimming holes, libraries, choruses, symphonies. Art and living—the art of living—have always been a very real part of the dream.

This is indeed a happy picture of American life—this seeming Utopia in which lives might be lived to the fullest, and it is true that the American ideal has always held these things uppermost.

But we must frankly ask ourselves what materials have we provided the youth of this day with which to build toward that shining goal. Today there are approximately

four times as many people living in our great cities in America as there were at the dawn of the twentieth century, forty years ago. The average working week in America is now two and one-half days or twenty hours per week shorter than it was then and we have seen nothing yet in this regard. Yankee ingenuity will see to it that more effective machines are created to do the work of the world. Today unemployment and economic distress face us on every hand.

Mankind has always sought release from work, has sought more leisure. We should ask ourselves, "More leisure for what?" Increased leisure is ours in America, too much of it enforced leisure. It is in this balance that we are being tested today. Just this last year forty-one and one-half million hours of added leisure were granted annually to the workers in one of our American industrial companies in shortening the work week. Dr. John H. Finley, president of the National Recreation Association and editor of the *New York Times*, comments on the wide distribution of this new leisure when he points out that "the shortened day and the shortened week have now been given to millions upon millions of American people."

Can we in America meet this acid test which, in reality, is the test of any nation's civilization? The cultural, social, spiritual and economic future of America hinges on this factor of increased leisure time. Will it become an asset that will enrich our national life or will it become a liability which will debauch and tear down our finer national traditions?

In a report of the American Youth Commission entitled *How Fare American Youth?*, compiled by Homer B. Rainey and others, it is pointed out that only sixty per cent of all employable young people sixteen to twenty-four years of age have been able to find work. Their median wage is fifteen dollars a week and large numbers

of them work without pay. One out of eight finds his way to a state hospital. On our farms there are two million more youths than are needed. One and one-half million who would normally be married have been forced by our present economic situation to postpone that event. (The average age of marriage in the United States has been retarded approximately seven years in the last two generations.)

In the face of these problems and many others youth asks for more adequate recreational facilities; more playgrounds; community centers where supervised crafts, hobbies, forums, dramatics and music can be indulged in; swimming pools and organized sports to provide constructive outlet for their creative energies and interests. We seek for our youth the richest values in living. These values are to be found in spiritual, cultural, creative, personality and character development. Dr. Richard Cabot defines those things which men live by as work, play, love and worship. If society is to be true to its trust today it must make all resources available to youth as they strive to master and solve their many problems, particularly in the fields of vocational choice, religion or philosophy of life, and choice of a life partner and home building. What they are to be tomorrow they are now becoming. Will that process of unfolding be a beautiful thing, or will the resultant picture be something unworthy of American ideals?

The Menace of Crime

As we look about us we see cause for concern for the future. I quote J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U. S. Department of Justice, in his address before the General Federation of Women's Clubs at Kansas City, Missouri, this last May:

We know that crime is on an upward trend and that it is increasing among the youth of the land. Crime is basically a

youth problem and our young people are being arrested in far greater proportion than would seem to be possible. During the past year 18 per cent of the persons arrested were under twenty-one years of age. They, however, accounted for 13 per cent of the murderers, 28 per cent of the robbers, 42 per cent of burglars, 30 per cent of thieves, 51 per cent of car thieves, and 24 per cent of rapists arrested in our United States. These youths are the living examples of neglected home training and the failure of society to properly meet its obligations to the younger generation.

It is true that the home suffers most and worst from the evils that follow in the wake of crime. Think for a moment, if you will, of the home that sends forth criminals that prey on society. Think of the millions of mothers whose lives were saddened and crushed by over 4,500,000 sons and daughters who proved recreant to the high hopes, to the ambitions and the idealistic longings that greeted their entry upon their earthly careers—shattered hopes, broken hearts, grief and sorrow for the mothers of those individuals, and suffering and terror for the mothers of those who became their victims.

Speaking of home responsibility on other occasions, Mr. Hoover points out these facts as "an undeniable indictment of the American parent of today."

Lewis E. Lawes, warden of Sing Sing Prison, in an address before a round table conference in 1936 dealing with crime and youth today, pointed out that a man or woman is not born a criminal. "I have found," says Mr. Lawes, "that problem children are usually created by problem parents. When the home fails to shape the behavior patterns of children, then other social agencies must assume the burden of developing in them wholesome and well-integrated personalities." Possibly here is the clue to a feasible answer.

Speaking again of this vast army of youth who are of criminal inclination, Mr. Hoover says, "These might have been good citizens instead of prison fodder if society had not failed in its duty to them." True, the home is the bulwark of American society, but the home cannot always be the influence which well-meaning parents might

desire because of the present maelstrom of social and economic forces which revolve about that home. We are our brother's keeper in the intricacy of modern life in a larger measure than ever before. Possibly we have tried to fool ourselves into thinking that someone else would have to pay the bill. Mr. Hoover has estimated that the monetary cost of crime totals about fifteen billion dollars a year in America. Somebody must pay this bill. If a per capita tax were levied on every American citizen each would pay a minimum of \$120 annually to meet this expenditure. If the entire cost of crime could be eliminated for two years that saving would pay off our entire national debt.

Mr. Hoover further points out that "No insurance company in the world would insure buildings in a town where the fire department extinguished only fires which were actually consuming buildings. The lowest insurance rates exist in cities where fire departments enforce every fire law and are consistently vigilant to see that fires do not occur." As we can easily see, this implies a preventive program. As he states, it is important "to hamstring crime before crime hamstrings society. . . . It seems inconceivable that anything but a supine nation would willingly shoulder the additional load which we are now carrying."

As Sanford Bates, former director of federal prisons, points out, "We believe it more important to prevent society's mistakes in dealing with youth than to try to correct such mistakes after they have been made." In this preventive process he lays stress upon a directed and organized program for youth along constructive lines of interest.

The Importance of Play

In a very practical approach then, let us ask ourselves frankly, "What are the American people doing and what do they propose to do about this situation?" The job is

too big to be accomplished through any one type of program or by any one agency or jurisdiction. Home, school, church, community organization, jurisdictions of government must make their contribution. Within the home, parents are recognizing that the "family that plays together stays together." There are two classes of parents—those who are playmates of their children and those who are strangers to their children, and thinking parents everywhere want to be in the first category. As a result, parent-teacher organizations, women's clubs, men's clubs, and many other types of civic and community organization are stressing the importance of an adequate family recreation life. To this end recreation departments in many parts of the country are promoting home-centered recreation contests and our current magazines are filled with many practical suggestions of ways and means in which the family may share their good times together.

School leaders and progressive educators throughout the country are recognizing as never before the importance of training for avocation as well as for vocation. Eugene T. Lies, in his thought-provoking book, *The New Leisure Challenges the Schools*, outlines the fine things being done to train our youth for the wise use of leisure. On the premise, "When we work we make a living, when we play we make a life," educators are matching tools with which to make a living—the three R's of yesterday—with sports, dramatics, crafts, social recreation, games, nature study, and other similar fields of interest, as the tools with which to make a life. These they think of as an integral part of education, not frills as some unthinking people have called them, but a vital part of the foundation for successful living. Because the educational structure of yesterday did not afford these important features many adults of today are impoverished in their recreational life. The proof of this statement rests in the fact

that although recreation, as we are told in a report of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, is annually the fourth largest composite business in the United States, out of the three or four billions of dollars spent yearly in search of so-called recreation and good times more money is spent upon slot gambling machines than upon directed programs of constructive activity for our youth.

Speaking of the importance of close collaboration of recreational and educational leaders, Dr. Harry A. Wann, principal of the public schools in Madison, New Jersey, states, "It is important that programs of recreation and education be coordinated if the community is to be best served. School buildings, playgrounds and facilities should be available for use of the entire membership of the community."

Showing vital concern in constructive use of leisure and in the promotion of an adequate program of recreational life for the American people, progressive leadership in our churches is now advocating that the church shoulder its full responsibility in this field. Religious leadership of yesterday laid more stress upon what should *not* be done than upon what *could* be done, as conducive to spiritual development. In other words, the emphasis was *taboo*, not *do*. As contrasted with this inadequate philosophy, ways and means of bringing about church-centered recreational life are now being advocated on every hand. To be effective religion must touch all areas of life and because recreation hours now occupy a larger proportion of the week's calendar than ever before, church life, in some sense, should be synonymous with play or recreation time.

In a recent report of a committee of one of our leading Protestant denominations in southern California on the subject of the church and leisure, a typical thoughtful approach to the problem is embodied in the following skeleton outline of topics: the new leisure, leisure and

recreation, commercialization of leisure, community program for leisure, education for leisure, effects of the new leisure on the program of the church, church-centered recreation.

Probably the greatest impetus toward providing an adequate recreational service to meet growing needs has come about through the agencies and jurisdictions of government. The establishment of municipal recreation services is to be noted in increased number on every hand. Likewise county, state and federal efforts in this regard have been multiplied manyfold in recent years. This very definitely is part and parcel of a new philosophy as to the function of government. More and more, humanitarian services are being recognized and stressed. Recreation is a function of progressive government. Speaking on "Recreation and Democracy as Related to Citizenship," at the National Recreation Congress held in Atlantic City, New Jersey, last May, V. K. Brown of Chicago, said:

It is important that citizens share in community sports, music, drama, arts and crafts, social affairs, and other activities so as to make democracy an intimate and personal thing at this time when the democratic spirit is threatened from many sources. People live their way into citizenship by being part of, and by contributing to, the general current of the community life.

Daniel A. Poling, editor-in-chief of the *Christian Herald*, says:

Recreation in the United States in our time has come to be spelt in capital letters, R-E-C-R-E-A-T-I-O-N. Here are comprehended the needs of all ages and the requirements of all circumstances of life. At the very heart of the recreation program lies the vital life of the whole national recovery movement. City, county, state and federal governments will do well to unite all their activities to make the new leisure an asset and not a liability, and to achieve through it a constructive program which has as its goal a more abundant life for men, women, and children. I am convinced that the support of parks, playgrounds,

and community centers, the employing of competent leaders, are not only a good investment of tax money but that they make more secure every institution of our public life.

Preventing Delinquency

Recreation is justified today for many reasons—as an aid to public health, as an aid to the modern educational process, as a channel for character and personality development, as a means of creating new markets to insure revival and survival of business, as an aid to home and community development. One of the most potent arguments for promoting recreation programs is that such programs are probably the best deterrents for juvenile delinquency known. Taking a cautious look at this latter emphasis, thoughtful recreation leaders point out that recreation is not a cure-all nor is it the sole antidote for our social problems. Some feel that the prevention of delinquency has been used too much in presenting the programs of recreation and similar agencies to the public. Recreation is recognized as only one factor that may affect delinquency. Because housing, education, mental and physical health, economic status and other factors have a definite bearing, the general public may ultimately realize that extravagant claims have been made which cannot be substantiated. It is hard to isolate recreation and its effects in any study of delinquency rates. There are too many other contributing factors.

On the other hand, certain specific experiments have been carried forward which bring us definite proof of the effectiveness and practicability of a well-conceived and directed recreation program as a deterrent for delinquency and crime. Speaking specifically on the subject, Kenyon J. Scudder, chief probation officer of the County of Los Angeles, an ardent believer in the adage, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," states as follows:

Youth responds to clean play, yet only a small percentage of youth has an opportunity to participate in well-organized play activities. A well set up recreational program is one of the most potent factors in the prevention of juvenile delinquency. In a recent study of some 14,000 juvenile court cases in Los Angeles County it was found that less than 14 per cent of these youngsters who got into trouble belonged to any organized group except the gang on the street. If 86 per cent of these children in difficulty do not belong to anything is it any wonder they find themselves in court?

Criminals are not born—we make them. But we might at the same time be making decent citizens out of the host of boys and girls from whom the future group of criminals come.

In one particular district in Los Angeles County we were spending \$125,000 a year taking some five hundred children into the juvenile court in a period of eighteen months. A well-organized recreation program including the extension of character building facilities brought this down 32 per cent during the next year and a half. The \$38,400 saving is a mere drop in the bucket as compared with the social values involved affecting the children of this neighborhood.

We must coordinate all of the organizations and agencies in the district as well as the facilities available so that we may use them to capacity. When we do this we shall make a big dent in the problem of delinquency.

With reference to this particular experiment the writer was privileged to make a first-hand study of these developments, and in 1936 recorded certain findings as follows:

This study, which covers only the so-called metropolitan area of Los Angeles, reports a juvenile population between the ages of five to seventeen inclusive, of 207,184 boys and girls. Of this number 191,964 are enrolled in the schools of the district.

The records of the juvenile court and other agencies dealing with delinquent youth within this area report a total of 6382 so-called delinquent boys and girls. Of this number 4635 are boys and 1747 are girls. A study of the rate per thousand reveals that approximately 46 boys out of each 1000, and 17 girls out of each 1000, are recognized as problem individuals. Putting this report in another form, it is noted that about three out of each 100 boys and girls are listed as delinquents.

This is far too many. But is youth to blame? Putting our statement in a fairer and more optimistic light, the author, in defense of youth, calls attention to the fact that 97 out of each

100 are leading normal constructive lives in spite of the hazards and temptations which an *adult-made* society has thrown about them. Only three out of each hundred have failed to make successful adjustment to the city dweller's mode of living as established by generations gone before. Here often standards of success are measured in terms of wealth and power accumulation rather than in terms of character and personality development.

But why do three out of each 100 fail to make this difficult adjustment? Let us search for the causes of delinquency. A study of the inmates of Juvenile Hall, the detention home for Los Angeles County, revealed the fact that 85 per cent had never had a constructive play life. A further study reveals the fact that about 85 per cent of the events which get youth into trouble transpire during periods when they are searching for the so-called good time, in search of a thrill, a kick out of life.

In searching more specifically for the causes of youth delinquencies we find that in 42.9 per cent of all boys' cases and 28.4 per cent of all girls' cases within the specific area studied, bad associations within the community have been contributory factors. Lack of constructive planning for wholesome contact of youth with the community at large brings a terrific toll.

But the fault does not lie entirely out in the community. It is significant to note that 19.7 per cent of the boys and 27 per cent of the girls listed as delinquent come from broken homes where for either natural or other causes one or both of the parents are missing. In addition to this situation in 29 per cent of all cases other unfavorable home conditions are listed as contributory causes. So let us be fair to youth and recognize the fact that back of the problems of boys and girls lie problem situations among the adults of the community. Boys and girls within the home have had to look to an unkind community for their good times, often with disastrous results.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the peak of delinquency is to be found at the time when, for physiological, psychological and sociological reasons, the boy and girl break away from home influence and restraint. The sixteen year old boy and girl have the hardest time to come through with flying colors.

There is a steady climb upward in the number of juvenile arrests to a peak at the sixteen year level with a sharp decline noted in the next year. The tendency to get into difficulties in search of a good time leads many into dangerous types of expression. At this point society has politely hidden its face and talked in hushed tones instead of frankly facing with young

people their biggest problem of adjustment by helping to provide an opportunity for wholesome corecreational activity.

A prominent Los Angeles judge of the juvenile court recently remarked that three fourths of the things that get youth into trouble smell of gasoline. He implied that an automobile or something accessory to it was used as a tool or means in which, through which, or for which the offense was committed. With over one-third of youth's difficulties actually happening in the streets it certainly would appear that the streets are not a safe place for children to seek their recreation, and yet how many parents turn their boys and girls loose to forage for their good times. When we look at some homes, however, we feel that children may be safer in the streets. In fact 20 per cent of juvenile offenses, so Burt¹ tells us, transpire at home, and 11.2 per cent while at school. Again the difficulty may be traced to lack of a compelling constructive play program that challenges the enthusiastic wholehearted participation of the boy and the girl.

A study of the hours at which juvenile delinquencies occur indicates that there seem to be two peak points of danger in the daily schedule of the child. They are at four o'clock in the afternoon when the boy or girl is released from school responsibilities and looks about for adventure and excitement, and after the evening meal when the lure of the street and the gathering darkness again call him forth to seek many promised thrills and means of diversion. It is interesting to compare the peak hours of juvenile delinquency with that at which the greater number of adult crimes are committed. The zero hour in the case of adults is shortly after midnight. The reason for the difference is obvious. Adult crime is more vicious, more malignant, premeditated. The juvenile usually offends without malice or premeditation. Energies misguided without a constructive outlet find expression in the first thing at hand which promises a "good time." Recognizing these factors, a new technique is being developed among juvenile delinquency and crime prevention workers in collaboration with recreation and character building agencies. This technique takes into account the redeeming powers of well-directed play and recreational activities.

About one third of all juvenile cases referred to the juvenile bureau of the Los Angeles police department are upon investigation turned over to the juvenile court. About two thirds of all cases are handled without the necessity of juvenile court action. Approximately one half of these are released to the custody of a probation officer, parent or guardian and the majority of those remaining are released on indications that good behavior will result in the future. In releasing the boy and the girl on

1. Burt, Cyril, *The Young Delinquent* (New York: Appleton, 1925).

these plans definite steps are taken to connect the individual with a constructive leisure time program to take the place of detrimental influences.

All agencies interested in the welfare of children have made their facilities and program available to help in this situation. More particularly the Los Angeles playground and recreation department, the schools, private settlements, character building agencies and churches have cooperated in presenting an attractive leisure time program for youth. These agencies have pooled their efforts through the coordinating council plan of action and are, more and more, presenting a united front to community need for action.

Extremely active in this development has been the crime prevention division of the Los Angeles city police department. In 1933 an experimental program was initiated in the Hollenbeck Heights area, comprising six and three-quarters square miles with a population of 83,000. A plan was devised whereby children found in gangs loitering on the streets late at night were taken home to their parents. Officers explained to them the dangers of such activities and asked the cooperation of parents in sending their children to a playground community center or similar organization. Delinquency was estimated to have decreased 50 per cent during the first year, and the plan proved successful to the extent that in 1935 it was placed in operation throughout the entire city. A formal report on developments for the month of March 1936 showed a total of 589 juveniles so introduced to supervised recreation activities during the month.

But a period of years, not months, is required to prove the worth of such a program. Speaking two and one-half years later on this subject, E. M. Slaughter, commanding captain of the crime prevention division, who has carried forward this work under the enthusiastic support and leadership of James E. Davis, chief of police, states as follows:

The greatest value of this program lies in the supervision of leisure time activities of youth. It is valuable not only in the

cases referred to recreational and character building activities and to case working agencies, but is instrumental in keeping thousands of other youngsters tied more closely to the home.

It must be remembered that recreation departments and group work agencies should be an adjunct to the home and not an influence to wean children away from it. We believe that the child who spends much of his leisure time in the home is usually a better student, maintains higher moral standards, is better adjusted socially and in the long run finds surer happiness than does the child who finds substitution for this stabilizing influence in other fields. However, there is crime prevention value in the group work program of our modern character building agencies and recreation departments where the child finds adventure, develops leadership ability and good sportsmanship under the guidance of a trained staff.

Leadership

This statement stresses the importance of leadership. If the community is to fulfill its obligation, provision must be made for facilities, program and leadership. Of these, without question leadership, which may be defined as influencing people to work or play together toward a common objective, is the most important. Character is caught, not taught, and the most potent factor in the catching process is the leader.

When society as a whole fulfills its obligation to youth there will result as a direct antithesis to criminal intent and purpose the qualities to be noted in a true sportsman. May I give you these high lights of what constitutes a good sportsman:

Does not quit
Does not alibi
Is not a rotten loser
Does not gloat over winning
Does not take unfair advantage
Does not ask odds he is unwilling to give
Is always ready to give his opponent the shade
Does not underestimate his opponent
Nor overestimate himself

Honors the game he plays, for he who plays the game straight and hard wins even when he loses

Remembers that the game is the thing and that he who thinks otherwise is a mucker and no true sportsman.

Recognizing the place which leadership plays in producing this fine code of sportsmanship, which is in reality a philosophy of social living, the San Francisco Recreation Commission has for the past eight years sponsored what is called the director-at-large plan. Special recreational guidance has been offered to problem boys referred through the various community agencies which work with children. "We have sought," says Josephine Randall, superintendent of recreation, "to follow the principle that one of the major solutions of the problem of juvenile delinquency is to divert the attention and energies of these boys in their formative years to wholesome supervised recreation during their leisure time. . . ."

Under the plan these directors-at-large, as the name implies, work at large in particular districts of the city where special services and leadership are needed. Unrestricted by the responsibilities of supervising or directing the activities at a particular recreation center, they move freely through their areas and refer individual boys and groups of boys to the various public and private recreation centers in the vicinity. Hence they cooperate with all the community leaders at work with children.

Because of their complete knowledge of all recreational facilities and programs within the district they are specially qualified to select the best leisure time program adaptable to the needs of the individual boy.

Upon the director's ability to properly do this it is felt the success of this plan is dependent as an effective weapon against crime. It is obvious that the director-at-large must be an individual with unique and high qualifi-

cations. He must know the people of his district, their social habits and economic status; and discover as far as possible the subversive influences in the vicinity. His job is to divert youth away from these influences to those fine wholesome and constructive programs of activity interest that are available. Many testimonials have been received as to the effectiveness of this director-at-large plan.

Many other splendid programs which serve to introduce youth to areas of wholesome interest as an antidote for destructive influences within the community are being carried forward throughout the United States with varying degrees of success. In practically every major city of the West, and I am sure that it is generally true throughout the nation, superintendents of recreation and their associates are constructively endeavoring to provide the boys and girls in their respective cities with channels of activities through which vigorous, healthy, intelligent and worthy citizens may be built.

In an ever-increasing measure, law enforcement officers, crime prevention officers, probation officers and others work shoulder to shoulder toward that end. We all feel sure that the results will be a better America.

VIII TEAMWORK FOR PREVENTION OF DELINQUENCY



Police Protective Work

ELISABETH LOSSING

*Crime Prevention Division, Police Department
Berkeley, California*

UNDER the inspirational guidance of August Vollmer, police chief, the crime prevention division of the Berkeley police department was organized in July 1925, with the slogan, *To do those things which promote the health, happiness and welfare of children.*

Berkeley then had a population in excess of 56,000 and represented a community friendly to its well-developed school department, its newly organized coordinating council, its well-established and coordinated social agencies, its progressive police department, then composed of forty members. It welcomed its newly acquired policewoman, gave her a heavy load of cases as well as wholehearted cooperation.

Since those early days 2000 women's cases have been worked upon and over 1000 cases of boys under twelve years of age. But for the most part this paper is concerned with the 2300 girls under twenty-one years of age.

Invariably people ask, "How do these girls get into your clutches?" During the first years the largest number of referrals were by parents, relatives or guardians. Now the fine, socialized group of police officers refer the largest number, with parents slightly second. Before the present system of psychiatric consultation and counseling was established in our public schools, referrals from that

source were third in order, but appropriately they now fall much lower on the list. Next in order to parents come neighbors, stores, social agencies, friends, citizens, and the children themselves.

We have, according to police terminology, known girls under the following classifications of law violation: juvenile court law, petty theft, lewd and lascivious conduct, and so on. *Why* we have known these girls is the important question.

I have just finished a careful scrutiny of the list of these 2300 girls. With the perspective that the years and the sum total of life experience bring, with perhaps wiser eyes, I now see them as:

Girls whose problems never in the world should have been brought to the police department because they were of a minor nature, quick to heal in any environment.

Little girls, lost, crying for their mothers; wandering aimlessly, with running noses and dirty clothes, or flying from maternal wrath or from helter-skelter homes, unprotected and unprotected.

—Lonely, frightened, hungry, whimpering from maternal neglect; seeing, hearing, experiencing things that will color their dreams and pull the strings of their lives forever; overworked, overburdened, overstimulated; living in filth and misery where drunken, fly-swarming men sprawl on beds and floor, where drunken mothers lie asleep or set the house on fire.

—Caring for innumerable small brothers and sisters, breaking away finally, hard and defiant, seeing life askew; fighting, storming, battling at home and school, radical to the end of time; learning the scolding pattern of the shrew by asserting themselves against inflexible, old country discipline; remaining undisciplined and uncontrolled, becoming a law unto themselves, sowing seeds for future selfishness, dishonesty and unpopularity.

—Again, born defective, destined for institutional life, pitiful yet hopeless from the start; born dull, ever seeing moral issues through a fog; born sick, dragging along, bored, indifferent, unresisting.

—The bone of contention between wrangling parents, inured to the incessant pitch of quarreling voices, fearing a blow to self or mother; scared rabbits, daughters of dominating, or mentally ill parents; victims of a "Yes" program where mothers try to placate intolerant, arrogant fathers.

—Motherless, overshadowed by fathers, never facing the consequences of their acts; losing either parent, boarded out, never long enough in one home to let the tendrils of affection twine about a satisfying love object; abandoned, adopted, trying to fit in yet never reaching the heights; misfits forever.

—Really superior, yet dragged from pillar to post by selfish, "arty" mothers trying to eke out a miserable existence from some unmarketable service; normal, yet failing to satisfy the pride and ambition of thwarted parents; nervous, breaking under the strain, even attempting suicide; victims of overrigorous, overzealous mothers; dragged in by father or mother for the "police lady" to "throw a scare" into them.

—Helping themselves to toys and baubles in some cheap store.

—Precocious sexually, down in the creek bed or up in the attic with little boys, panties down, "rehearsing life" as Dr. von Hentig expresses it; uncomprehending, at the mercy of sex degenerates, perhaps their own fathers or stepfathers, or a trusted family friend, or a sex-crazed creature in a tangle of weeds in a vacant lot, or an arteriosclerotic in a neighborhood theater, or a senile old shopkeeper in his backroom with the bait of a penny or a stick of candy.

Older girls mentally retarded, playing at womanhood without any possibility of escaping trouble; with I. Q. too high for segregation or for sterilization until society fully sanctions such an innovation.

—Weak, pretty, irresponsible girls who follow the first beckoning finger of man or boy, who crumple into nothingness before they taste life; indiscriminating, wild to marry, who take on correspondence with the whole U. S. Navy, who follow the fleet and pitch themselves headlong into detention homes; hitchhikers, runaways; leaders, followers.

—Those who thrill at petting; who accept it because "they all do it"; who fall deeply in love, risk all and bear the consequences of pregnancy or abortion in ways characteristic of their personalities; those doomed from the start to settle into prostitution.

—Repressed, ever seeking escape through phantasy or the movies; unstable, neurotic, psychopathic, schizophrenic, inadequate to life. Misusing initiative, originality and creative impulses; hurrying up life; abusing privileges; trading on personality.

—Victims of degrading homes or situations, yet maintaining a something that wins out; victims of mistakes, yet living them through; emerging from adolescent flings with wisdom that will help them with their own children.

To be utterly frank, some have got well because of us, more have got well in spite of us, the rest haven't got well at all.

I look down the long list of names and wonder where those girls are now and what they are doing. Some we know are in state hospitals for the insane; Sonoma State Home for the Feeble-minded—or perhaps sterilized and on parole or discharged; in other institutions, such as the Salvation Army Maternity Home, the Pacific Coast Res-

cue Home, the Lovina Gibson Home of the Big Sisters; or Tehachapi, the California Institution for Women.

Some are in foster homes. Fortunately a large number are in homes of their own, busily reproducing, wheeling baby buggies, coming in to show new babies, saying, "If I had had this, I wouldn't have run away so much. This is what I needed." Some are engaged to the "grandest fellow"; others are in a state of flux, wandering here, wandering there, never "jelling"; still floundering; running away on the slightest pretext from something or toward something; petting, "just enough" or too much. Many are in college; in high school; making up credits in continuation school; turning over a new leaf in junior high schools. The others, we believe, are adjusted, happy, busy, useful, able to laugh about how they "snapped out of it."

Almost before we know it our little girls of today will be women. Are we doing all that we can for them?

At what point did that battered old wreck of a drunk become hopeless? What made that young woman decide to don the blue satin shorts of the prostitute? Why has she cast her lot with Filipinos? What shall we say to that young woman when she wakes up in a cell with her beautiful clothes ruined by last night's debauch?

What conditioning might have calmed the wildcat temper of that young woman?

Isn't that persistent young troublemaker an old encephalitic? Should jail be her haven?

Couldn't that bovine-looking creature have been sterilized before all twelve of her feeble-minded children were born?

Why did that woman give up a good home, a good husband, a good name, for drink and hobo hobnobbing?

Why do these foul-mouthed, middle-aged women for-

sake their children's welfare for worthless young drunkards?

Aren't too many girls and older women breaking mentally?

Aren't too many poor old seniles living wretchedly?

Psychiatrists reiterate that treatment begins from the *first moment of contact* with our clients. Over such problems as these, there will have to be much laying together of heads of psychiatrists, psychologists, economists, judges, social workers and others.

Using Community Resources

Many of our young people's problems have to be taken to the probation office and juvenile court; others who seem to give promise we place on our unofficial police probation system, investigating the situation and the young person herself. Psychiatric examination and recommendations, the use of community resources, and personnel work done by volunteers have been part of the program. The volunteers are recruited from the students in training of the University of California social service curriculum, from the University of California Y. W. C. A., from the Junior League and from other sources. Probationers meet their volunteers in the children's room in our office. An attempt is made to fit the volunteer to a particular child's needs. Thus scientific bents, creative talents and practical tendencies have been developed. Even more important are the friendships that have ripened. Young girls treasure memories of their "college girl friend." It would be impossible to estimate the good that has come from such contacts both to the probationers and to the volunteers. Volunteers become social workers, teachers, mothers, voters, civic leaders, club women—have they not become more understanding of girls and their needs and of community responsibility?

Our daily time sheets show the number of calls we make to schools, hospitals and to all social agencies. They show also that our office is the setting for interviews with representatives of all these agencies. We have leaned on the Social Service Index from the beginning, on the probation office, the recreation department, the coordinating council, the Public Health Nursing Service, the Red Cross, churches, women's clubs and allied groups.

Today the population of Berkeley has grown to an estimated 100,000, which is not supposed to include the nonresident 16,199 University of California students. The police force, headed by chief John A. Greening, now numbers 75, including a young and vigorous second policewoman appointed late in 1934. All are kept more than busy.

The vice detail does not let anyone under twenty-one hang around pool halls; does not permit anyone under twenty-one in places where liquor is sold unless meals are regularly sold there also; does not permit slot machines to operate; checks newsstands against the sale of salacious literature; checks certain public buildings against the congregating of undesirable persons, and watches the general situation wherever young people are involved.

Our girls are restless as can be seen from our steadily rising rate for runaways. They no longer make timid little thrusts into the world. They strike out boldly, swiftly and surely. They handle their affairs rather well, all things considered. They can't be blamed for wanting to leave some parents and some homes before the California law says they are free to do so at twenty-one. They don't agonize so much as formerly about an illegitimate baby or two. They arrange abortions in a rather matter of fact way. They would have us know they consider their lives their own. They have little tolerance

with oldfashioned ideas. They smoke, they drink, they pet, if they wish to do so. They think they are sophisticates, but some chance remark betrays them. They simply are part of the picture of this day and age.

The organized character building agencies in Berkeley, such as the University of California Y. W. C. A. (a downtown Y. W. C. A. is about to be launched), Girl Reserves, Camp Fire Girls and Girl Scouts have modern programs which take in large groups of young girls. Would that funds permitted them to operate in all parts of town. Would that *strong leadership* could be developed to double and triple their work so that little girls could all be tied to some activity of their hearts' desire, *before* they become blasé and *before* the lure of commercialized amusements gets in their blood. How young that can be, is not always reckoned with.

Our Saturday morning sewing class here in the crime prevention division has girls as young as four, eager, wide-eyed, brown-skinned, attractive, wanting to be part of something alive and interesting. They should not have to come to the police department for it, but our National Youth Administration girl worker, our University of California girl volunteers and Junior Leaguers, think of such fascinating things to do with needle and thread, paste pot, wallpaper books and raffia! Ideally there should be small neighborhood units in the nature of settlement houses to which these responsive little creatures could attach themselves.

More and more we are inclined to group work methods with our little boys and young girls. Our boys love their workshop in the basement of a police officer's home where they meet Saturday mornings. It is subsidized by a generous hearted man who has bought the boys an electric train, basketball and football outfits, wig-wag flags, a bugle, and full camping equipment; who has made it

possible to pay for a Saturday morning teacher; who buys milk to accompany the generous hot lunch given the boys and the girls each Saturday noon by a local catering company. (We early found there was the closest correlation between juvenile delinquency and empty stomachs.) Until her illness this spring, Mrs. Sarah Boynton gave us a very rare kind of volunteer service, winning these little, savage-like creatures through sharing herself and her home with them until they have become unbelievably socialized, ready now for the more conventional type of character building activity. May I read a few extracts from Mrs. Boynton's vivid reports which show how these boys feel about things?

Dick came up to my house tonight. He ate four big servings of dinner and then another sandwich. I asked him how he happened to be so hungry and he said, 'Well, you get awful tired eating Italian stuff. We have it all the time now. Alberto cooks it.' I asked who Alberto was and he said it was his mother's boy friend who lives down the street a ways. 'He's awful jealous of her and he doesn't want her to go out. Sometimes they fight. Sometimes he comes to see her at three o'clock in the morning. He comes in through the back door and comes through the house to see if she is at home.'

Dick told about his new house, 'It's better than the other house and my mother keeps it pretty good, but I feel sorry for anyone who drinks in our place. They could fall down the steps and get killed just as easy. My mother likes us kids. She tries to be good to us but I feel sorry for us kids, she has another man and I don't even know his name. . . .'

It was the morning Tom and Harry were being sent away. Harry jangled his pig bank and held it up saying, 'See, the cops put pennies in it and nickels and dimes. I guess they thought the pig was hungry too, like I am most of the time. Gee, it's belly's fat and full.' Ma reached for the pig. Harry clutched it tighter to his chest, ducked and ran around the house, snarling, 'No you don't, no you don't. I know your tricks. You'd steal it all from me if you could. I don't trust you.'

Harry's sister, Gertie, came out and he said, 'You ought to see Gertie's guy's arm. He got a shot or a cut in it. It's a wonder she don't get a bullet in her the way she fools around with guys. Guys kick her. You'd think she'd learn some les-

sons from the guys but she don't. She don't care much about anything except running around. She let the little baby get sick and die.'

Tom said, 'Now I got to go back to that lousy house in Oakland. There ain't no sun. How could there be? One window for sun to come through, a little space between houses. Houses close together. I hate it. I like the sun. I like to be in big spaces not in cramped, dirty houses without sun.'

Harry and Tom were talking about war. Harry mumbled, 'Smoke, shells, bombs, dead guys all over! I sure feel sorry for Gertie. Her guy sure kicks the stuffing out of her. What a life! Fights! Why our life's like war! Our life's like hell—screaming—yelling—no peace—no nuthin'—not even enough food.'

'We came up to the police department to be fingerprinted. We were told they'd be taken at the school, that it would be better that way.' Tom said, 'Don't they know we are volunteerin' to do this? If we have them done at school we'll *have* to, and we won't be *made* by the school. They make us do enough now.' The officer didn't like it very much and wanted to know if it was Mrs. Lossing's idea. I said, 'No, the boys thought of it.' He could not understand why they wanted to be fingerprinted at the police department. I tried to explain to him that they feel more friendly to the police department than they do to the school.

Varied Activities

It would delight me, were there time, to tell you of the shop boys' joy over their free weekly swims at the Y, of their almost delirious delight at being taken for a four-day camping trip last summer by Mrs. Boynton (Tom threw his arms around her and kissed her and said, "You do think of the nicest things for us poor kids, Mrs. Boynton"), of their pride at starting off last week for the West Berkeley Y camp at Putah Creek, their week's vacation the gift of the Hi-Twelve Club. It would delight you to hear of our annual Christmas party for seventy or eighty children, with the great, colorful "edible Christmas tree" in the center of the sparkling, fragrant children's room—a real community enterprise. But I shall have to leave all these things to your imagination

which I hope is the kind of imagination that comprehends the radiant spontaneity of children, the utter joy they feel in their high moments when lifted up from the drab, gray, everyday of their lives, the deep devotion they give to those who, they feel, are kind, not mean to them!

Do you like to hear fifty or sixty colored children sing their hearts out? Do you like to feel their abandon to dance music? Do you like to watch them make amazing things out of gay little scraps? Then rejoice that the crime prevention division had the inspiration, and its colored volunteer, Mrs. Vivian Osborne Marsh, the patience and skill to work out the summer playhouse idea which is now repeating its six weeks' success of last year, another interesting piece of community cooperation.

We are giving moral support to another colored project in south Berkeley at the present time, also working definitely toward the establishment of a small, new recreation center in northwest Berkeley, so that the children there can let off legitimate steam instead of setting fire to freight cars and breaking up old factory buildings.

Berkeley has a most active recreational all-year program in its many parks and playgrounds. All of the parks have some kind of clubhouse, all have girls' clubs. All through the year one sees young people keenly interested and participating in especially arranged programs and events, such as the famous pet show, circus, or vehicle day at Berkeley High School, aquatic week at the year-old Aquatic Park, nature week, kiddies' week, pageant week, boys' and girls' week, doll show for girls, hobby show, and so on. This week it is "learn to swim week" and youngsters are seen hurrying along the streets, to and from the high school gym with towels around their necks or with dripping hair. Every imaginable day sport is featured; at night they have tennis.

Three well-equipped out-of-town camps are maintained in the Sierras and in the Redwoods. For the past two years there has also been a Redwood Camp for boys and a Sequoia Camp for girls. A confidential problem child list is received each summer by the director, and also by the chief of police, from the school counselors. If these children don't come to the playground they are encouraged to do so. A confidential report is sent back to the counselors at the end of summer.

The W.P.A. has classes in badminton, tennis, flower arrangement, bridge, tap dancing, ballroom dancing, story telling, model airplane building and boat modeling, puppetry, handicraft and other group interests.

A booklet called "Play in Berkeley," published monthly by the chamber of commerce, tells about possible opportunities for play—horseback riding, hiking to fascinating spots, community plays, community sings, nature study exhibits, the City Rose Garden, the University Botanical Gardens, golf, bowling, yachting, and a very great many more interests.

Dr. Virgil Dickson, superintendent of schools, has a rich program and an eager desire to build soundly. He describes a general trend in the secondary field to adjust the course of study to get high school pupils into cooperative work programs, in the senior year particularly. In that way the young people may associate in a normal way in homes and businesses and may have access to work apprenticeship, some even having actual pay. The superintendent of schools in Atlanta, Georgia, sees that a relationship is established for nearly every high school student before graduation so that he is individually sponsored in the community and tied to an adult point of thinking. Berkeley is thinking along these lines and a rather receptive attitude to the idea is encountered in the labor unions.

Berkeley has certified home teachers for crippled children two hours a week; a visiting teacher; a junior employment service. The federal program is flourishing—for example, McKinley Continuation School has practical courses in beauty work, in tearoom management, and in home nursing.

School girls' clubs of a live nature exist in the high school and in all the junior high schools. An interesting girls' club called the Drum and Bugle Club which the Job's Daughters maintain rehearses on the Garfield Junior High School grounds. The girls wear snappy uniforms, participate in local and out-of-town parades, compete with adults and altogether have a wonderful time. This program is particularly interesting when you consider how much more difficult it is to get girls formed into recreational groups than it is for boys.

Berkeley's evening schools play a sound part in contributing to the balance of youngsters, keeping up ambition while the elusive job is materializing. The total enrolment is now over 3000. Girls under twenty take secretarial studies and handcraft, principally.

An extremely interesting summer project is set up for the second year in the Hillside School where a demonstration elementary school is put on by the university. In a fascinating and vivid way, studies will be made of those activities of present-day life which most challenge children's attention, such as the milk supply, the mail system, the lore of the Southwest, world trade, food production and so on. We are utilizing the free scholarships given to us for our youngsters.

The Berkeley Coordinating Council has launched one of the newest and most significant projects for youth groups. In the Berkeley public schools it has set up a community service bureau which offers information and

orientation to young people and acts as a referral center in their various fields of interest.

In looking through the bureau files the other day with this topic in mind, I gathered references to the children's home maintained by the Berkeley Welfare Society, where children from broken homes receive care and training in habit formation or in correction of behavior difficulties; to the Book Lovers' Study Club, a group for colored women; to Business Girls' Clubs; to the Federal Music Project; the Cinderella Club for household employees; the W.P.A. maids' training course, sponsored by the Berkeley League for Women Voters.

The Berkeley Day Nursery assists the protective work by various follow-up activities; all girls over seven years of age belong to a sewing class and practically all the old girls come back for various follow-ups. The nursery tries to keep in touch with the children after they leave. It acts as a setting for an interesting project known as the Community Music School, run by the National Association of Musicians, which has branches in many large cities and settlements of the United States and is subsidized. These and countless other projects have been coordinated by the community service bureau in the public schools.

The churches, the service clubs and the men's clubs of Berkeley have well-formulated programs for protective work.

Berkeley's liveliest social interest is the community dance plan, a successful substitute for the commercialized dance-hall, of which Berkeley has none. For two years this plan has been in preparation. It is sponsored by the Berkeley Junior Chamber of Commerce, an organization of young men from twenty-one to thirty-five years of age, who carried their plan to the school board and other civic leaders who now endorse the dances.

The dances are held weekly on Saturday nights from

nine to twelve in the Berkeley high school gym because it is the largest auditorium in Berkeley. The attendance at ten dances represented a total of 5000. For one dance, top attendance is 450, average attendance, 330; attendance of 400 to 500 makes it pay.

The participants come from all parts of town, in couples, singly, or parents with daughters. Once in the dancehall the dancers are not permitted to leave the room until the evening is ended; a room is set aside for smoking; a checkroom is provided and all wraps must be checked, a five cent charge being collectible but not obligatory. Intermissions between dances are very short; the lights are cut so they do not glare upon the dancing couples, the dark spots are watched. Turning on the floodlight constitutes discipline when couples are dancing too closely. Patronesses are not needed because a group of younger men from the Junior Chamber of Commerce continually circulate around the floor. As an example of decorum, some 300 boys recently watched a fashion show modeled by high school girls and there were no catcalls. The inevitable proportion of wall-flowers diminishes by the innovation of inviting non-dancers to W.P.A. dancing classes. The music is excellent. Union bands of from seven to eleven pieces play all the newest dances. Union scale prices are from \$75 to \$125. This initial outlay, plus the price for novelties such as favors or entertainers, is defrayed in part by gate receipts but there is no worthier subsidy for social training of youth than an endowment for these community dances.

A few years ago a music house had the slogan, "Teach a boy to blow a horn and he won't blow a bank." Our musical institution, the Young People's Symphony Orchestra, affords wide cultural opportunities, education in musicianship, and training in the use of instruments to some fifty Berkeley boys and girls between the ages of

ten and eighteen years. An enrolment of 100 may be accommodated. Membership is open to all children of the bay region and the group includes all social levels. The only qualification is ability. A majority of the young musicians lack the finances necessary to the pursuit of a musical career. To offset this crippling start, the orchestra welcomes the young musician, offering to him free musical training, a rich background of musical appreciation, and expert instruction under an able orchestra leader. The boy or girl must provide his own instrument except for the more expensive ones. The cost of upkeep of the instruments and the music, and the director's salary are met by the Kiwanis Club of Berkeley which voted funds to back the orchestra.

Art opportunities are now afforded our Berkeley girls and boys as well as to those of other smaller cities and towns of northern California, through the recent grant of \$7500 by the Carnegie Corporation of New York to the San Francisco Museum of Art. The museum lends six exhibits of twenty fine color reproductions of original paintings, including old masters and moderns, for the nominal cost of \$10 for the entire series. These exhibits are free to the public and in Berkeley reached nineteen schools during the two weeks' exhibition period for each of the six exhibits.

Such community activities as these have the hearty cooperation of our police department. We see, perhaps more clearly than others see it, how every such effort by individuals, groups or organizations toward fuller and happier lives for Berkeley's children is recorded in a lessened rate of delinquency.



A State Crime Prevention Program

LOWELL JUILLIARD CARR

*Director, Michigan Child Guidance Institute
Ann Arbor, Michigan*

THE decline of the family and the face-to-face neighborhood, the disorganization of community mores in modern American life, and the inefficiency of merely legal corrective measures are throwing increased emphasis on behavior control by extralegal techniques. Unfortunately this development has usually proceeded piecemeal without adequate orientation to the total situation and without adequate coordination of extralegal agencies with one another or with the courts.

The coordinating council movement represents one important reaction to the obvious need of more unity of effort. But of course more unity of effort is not the only thing needed. There is also need of broader perspectives, more scientific information, more skilled techniques, intercommunity as well as intracommunity organization, and continuous effort to bring into one anticrime front all the forces of social control from the neighborhood to the local, state and national governments, the police, the courts, the administrators of our custodial institutions, social workers, the churches, the schools, scientists, the press and the best lay leadership.

During the last four years in Michigan, an attempt has been gradually taking form to mobilize science, social work, the courts, the schools, publicity, community leadership and governmental support for the reduction of juvenile delinquency. It is still only an attempt. I cannot point you to a single community in which the objective

has been fully achieved. And, as we all recognize, juvenile delinquency is only one of a score of community problems. But in a number of places in the state promising beginnings have been made in this restricted field.

As in many other states a great many different activities bearing in one way or another on behavior control are going on. There is no time here to describe the work of my colleague, Dr. Willard C. Olson, in developing methods of discovering predelinquents in the schools; nor to give proper credit to the work which is being done by the Detroit public school clinic, the Kellogg Foundation, the Michigan Children's Fund, and by various agencies of the state government itself, particularly the University of Michigan. All of these and others are assisting directly or indirectly, and some of them very vitally, in the attempt which is under way to integrate the court, the community and social work more closely on a state-wide basis.

This attempt is going forward mainly through three separate organizations: a privately supported social work experiment called the Ann Arbor Boys' Guidance Project; a state supported institution, the Michigan Child Guidance Institute, administratively part of the University of Michigan but legally separate; and finally a state-wide lay organization known as the Michigan Delinquency Prevention Council.

The function of the Ann Arbor Boys' Guidance Project, which is just entering its fourth year, has been to find out whether by combining case work and group work it is possible to apply the guidance clinic point of view to the adjustment of the behavior difficulties of predelinquents by utilizing all the adjustive techniques of a community including psychiatric service, at the same time keeping final responsibility for achieving total adjustment apart from and independent of any one specialized agency. The results which are now being prepared for publication

indicate in general that there are distinct advantages in combining case work and group work in one agency; that a summer camp, for example, can be of distinct diagnostic value; and that guidance techniques, starting in a summer camp and continuing into the community throughout the year, provide a service for maladjusted children not available in the ordinary community.

So much for the Ann Arbor Boys' Guidance Project. A more adequate description will soon be published in book form. In substance, the guidance project is an attempt to integrate court, community and social work on the level of the community by combining case work and group work.

The Child Guidance Institute

The Michigan Child Guidance Institute, which was established by the 1937 legislature, constitutes an attempt to integrate courts, communities and social work techniques on a county and state level. Authorized by law to study causes of delinquency, to recommend methods of treatment, and to coordinate the activities of public and private agencies, the institute is set up to do four things: (1) study community conditions underlying maladjustment and delinquency; (2) carry on a continuous program of publicity and education through lectures and a Delinquency News Letter which goes to 7800 key people every month; (3) stimulate improvements in community organization, i.e., organization and guidance of coordinating councils; and (4) diagnose and study cases referred by courts, schools or parents.

The distinctive thing about the clinical service provided by the institute is that full service depends on the organized cooperation of the county desiring it. We accept

cases from anywhere in the state on direct referral, and for such cases we merely send back reports based on the usual physical, social, psychological and psychiatric data like any other clinic. But for full service we send into a county a psychologist and two psychiatric social workers to make at a local school preliminary examinations of cases referred, send the more serious cases so examined on to Ann Arbor for full examination by pediatricians and psychiatrists. Later we *take back* to the school detailed recommendations which we ask the local referring group—teachers, physicians, probation officers—to talk over with the psychologist, the social workers and our community organizer at a case planning conference.

While by law we are forbidden to treat cases, we can and do supervise local treatment and keep contact with a case in subsequent planning conferences and by interim visits. The planning conference and the active organized cooperation of the local county leadership are distinctive features of the present setup. Details of organization vary somewhat, but in general we do not go into a county until all factions and important officials, including the juvenile court, are agreed that our services are wanted and that they will cooperate. Cooperation means that they must set up a county-wide organization centering in the court and the public schools, but including a representative of the county medical society and the organized social agencies. This county-wide organization provides us with suitable places in which to make the examinations; supplies preliminary social histories which must be satisfactory before cases are slated for examination; furnishes a report of a physical examination by a locally paid physician on each case; supplies written authority from the parents or from the juvenile court for the institute examination; and agrees to do something about the case after the institute's recommendations are brought back. Doing

something includes paying the cost of hospitalization, if necessary.

Two counties have organized themselves for full service which has been in progress since March first. Four other counties are in various stages of readiness. The difficulty at present is not to find counties ready to cooperate with us, but to keep our list of accepted counties within the capacities of our staff. As essentially a research organization set up to study delinquency, we are emphasizing completeness of data on each case and thoroughness of examinations. The examining unit stays at least a week in a county, the psychologist sees each case three times before the case is staffed, and cases referred to Ann Arbor for complete diagnosis are kept approximately a month.

Beginning this summer the case study service and the community studies are both to be centered in the same counties. Thus the institute will have not only the usual case history but detailed knowledge of the social factors surrounding the individual and his home.

With its community studies, clinical studies, information service and community organization service the institute is definitely aiming at closer integration of all legal and extralegal agencies in the state. The present setup is utterly inadequate, since the staff, aside from the director, includes only one psychiatrist, one psychologist, two social workers, one community organizer, two community research men, a secretary and a stenographer, with occasional part time stenographic assistance. Even with the services of the university psychological clinic and the university hospital for hospitalized cases, the present setup cannot handle more than one per cent of the state's maladjusted predelinquents. Hence the need of an intensive public relations program and continuing education of the state's leaders in the details of the problem.

The Delinquency Prevention Council

At this point the importance of the third organization, the Michigan Delinquency Prevention Council, becomes apparent. The Delinquency Prevention Council is a strictly nonsectarian, nonpartisan lay organization which was authorized in 1937 by a statewide conference sponsored by WWJ (the *Detroit News*) and a committee of state leaders from many fields. It is still in process of extending its membership since certain counties are not yet adequately represented. A state conference June third in Ann Arbor adopted a constitution and elected as president former State Senator H. P. Orr, who was at one time vice chairman of the State Crime Commission. A distinctive feature of the setup is the leadership committee of one hundred whose members are to act as centers of initiative in each county. The council plans to organize child welfare councils in every county with subgroups including members of the board of supervisors in every township. At present it is largely a paper organization, but there is every intention on the part of those concerned to make it function for the better organization of public opinion for the mobilization of all available techniques to reduce delinquency.

These three organizations, the Ann Arbor Boys' Guidance Project, seeking to mobilize adjustive techniques for demonstration purposes on a community level; the Michigan Child Guidance Institute, trying to do the same on a county and ultimately a state level; and the Michigan Delinquency Prevention Council, mobilizing leadership from the township to the state level, represent an attempt to integrate in one state the work of courts, social workers and community leaders for the more effective control of delinquency. Although one has been operating three years and the educational effort that led to the organization of

the other two goes back at least five years, the actual mobilization of techniques and public support has barely begun. The task of building behavior controls adequate to replace the old primary group and community moral pressures is apparently going to be a matter of decades if not generations.



Community Coordination, Its Philosophy, Principles and Trends

HARRY A. WANN

*Supervising Principal of Public Schools
Madison, New Jersey*

THE history of civilization is the story of men's efforts to learn to live together. One effective measure of civilization is the extent to which peoples have developed a spirit of cooperation in the interest of common welfare. The struggles between clans and tribes in ancient days and among primitive peoples everywhere are typical of a low stage in civilization. It is obvious, of course, that civilization does not advance on an even front. Sectors of activities push far ahead while at other points there is deplorable lag. Conflicts we observe over the world today between armed forces, between minority and majority groups, between vested interest and special interest groups, and between institutionalized agencies, represent failures in our struggle toward civilized living.

The contemporary American community provides a most interesting field of study in human relationships. We can best understand the present pattern of American community life by looking at it historically.

The pioneer settlement on the Atlantic seaboard in the colonial period represented a homogeneous group. Men and women with like religious and political beliefs escaped from suppression, persecution, and domination of majority groups in Europe and settled together in a new country where they could find expression of their common ideas. They carried into their new environment the ideas and

ideals of their continental homeland. Because of the conditions in the new and unfriendly land which necessitated an endless struggle against nature for their very existence, the constant alertness against common enemies, and a jealous nurture of the idealism which impelled them to such great sacrifice, these like-minded peoples were welded together in a cooperative community relationship which has not been surpassed and probably has not been approached in subsequent generations. The colonial community represented a simple pattern of life. It was isolated from other communities by vast distances. Slow and uninviting means of transportation and methods of communication separated it from distant parts by months or even years. Necessarily, all of life centered in the little group. They rejoiced together, celebrated festive occasions, worshipped in a common meeting house, worked beside their neighbors, and fought together against their common enemies. Vocation, religion, education, and personal and community welfare were matters of individual concern but in community-wide relationship.

In this simple society, three common institutions—the home, the church, and the school—served common needs. Children learned to work alongside their parents. They were economic assets in the pioneer home. Vocational education was a daily experience. Sharing community responsibility was a part of daily living. Religion was a potent factor in family life and conditioned social relationships. The common school in the community furnished simple instruction commensurate with their needs for the boys of the community, while the girls learned the skills necessary for them in the home.

Both out of the background of these people and out of their environment came the motives and the necessity for cooperative living. Pure democracy was typified by the New England town meeting where each could raise

his voice in the deliberations and where each was expected to share his part of the burden of community life.

Social Change

The pattern of community life was relatively simple. The method of meeting needs was direct. Face-to-face relationships were maintained in all areas of life. No problem of community coordination existed where the whole pattern of social life was predicated on cooperation.

This picture of the simple life of our pioneer villages has been drawn to contrast the early simple, agricultural, pioneer culture with the complex, urbanized, industrialized society which now maintains. The changes brought about by the industrial revolution gave rise to manifold new social problems. The efforts of the community to meet these new needs have complicated the pattern of community organization to the point where it almost defies analysis. A citizen will say of the community that it is overorganized, but a sociologist, looking at the same community, will see not a state of overorganization but rather congeries of institutions and agencies in a state of conflict, competition, and tension, so that instead of overorganization he sees a devastating lack of organization.

There seems to be now no integrating motive, no centripetal force which pulls together the multitudinous factors in the community, so the sociologist describes the scene he sees by the one term, "disorganized." The change in the status of youth in the community will serve to illustrate. Whereas in the early days the youth found all of his needs satisfied by the home, the church, the school, and the simple relationships of the isolated community, in contemporary society he finds himself living in a different kind of world. No longer is he an economic asset in

the home. Home industry is gone. One or both parents work outside the home. Legislation and economic conditions have recently conspired to sentence him to idleness through all his youth, and for millions this continues into adult life. This enforced leisure or idleness has put upon the community the responsibility of providing for him another occupation. The needs have arisen so abruptly and have been so insistent that there has been no time for working out an organized pattern for meeting them, but sporadic efforts have been made to serve and to salvage youth. Schools have extended their terms, lengthened their day, and expanded their program. So-called extra-curricular activities in areas of recreation, music, dramatics, and a bewildering variety of clubs constitute the program of the schools. Churches have termed themselves institutional and have adopted programs of recreation including athletics, music, dramatics, and clubs. Some of these methods, thought to be good, have been accepted and adopted generally. But they have resulted in competition, tension, and conflict, and the net result leaves much to be desired.

The Y.M.C.A., Y.M.H.A., Boy Scouts, Boys' Clubs, Cadets, Campfire Girls, and a multitude of other agencies have entered the field to serve youth. The American Youth Commission in a recent directory lists 330 national, nongovernmental youth-serving agencies. One half of these have been organized since the World War. In the past there has been almost no effort anywhere to coordinate the work of these so-called youth-serving agencies. The ambition of promoters and the enthusiasm of leaders in agencies motivated by the vested interest of position and prestige, have resulted in the most destructive kind of competition and inefficiency wherein youth has suffered. Studies in some communities have revealed the fact that often these agencies are reaching those who need their

services least and are neglecting wholly or in part those who need them most. They are competing for financial support, for the time of boards of directors, and for membership among the more favored groups of youth in the community.

The rate of delinquency in America is not decreasing. The age of the criminal indicates an appalling toll in the ranks of youth. We would not minimize the good which has been accomplished by all of the agencies serving youth, but we deplore their failure to achieve the notable contribution which might be made by an orderly, cooperative approach to the needs of any community.

The pattern of disorganization among youth-serving agencies which we have just described is typical in the areas of health, religion, adult education, and almost all phases of life. This question then naturally presents itself—Is there a method whereby social problems can be solved? This problem is not new in the thinking of social leaders. Efforts have been made repeatedly throughout the past few decades to bring together social forces working in particular areas. The development of the community chest for joint financing during and following the World War, and the organization of councils of social agencies, especially in the larger cities, represent this notable contribution.

The Cincinnati experiment in the social unit plan stimulated renewed interest and helpful thinking on the problem of community organization. More recently the development of community councils of great variety has focused the attention of leaders generally on the neighborhood or the community as a unit in social work.

Cooperative Planning

The simple question, it seems to me, which should determine our line of action is this—can we solve our social

problems best by pooling our resources and working cooperatively, or by our present pattern of disorganization resulting from competition? To me the answer is clear. The method, however, of achieving the desired aim is not so obvious. So many factors are involved, so much of prejudice and intolerance, of vested interest, bigotry and fear. Vested interest and precedent so color our thinking that even were leaders generally to accept wholeheartedly the thesis that cooperation alone can meet our needs, the achievement of that end would be long in coming.

In almost no area of life has an application of the scientific method been so neglected as it has been in dealing with social problems. Technology has applied scientific techniques in the material world. In dealing with social problems, however, because of the isolation of agencies, there has been only a piecemeal effort toward the application of research and science. Only through general cooperation can the scientific method be applied. This is basic to effective work. The rapid development of the community councils under such titles as coordinating councils, youth councils, neighborhood councils, and social planning councils gives encouragement to the sociologist and the social leader who are seeking a solution to the perplexing problem of community organization.

This type of organization seems to provide an instrument through which organized groups of professional and lay leaders in the community can focus attention on community needs. It becomes the medium through which community resources can be pooled by fact-finding, study, action, and evaluation. Seldom does one agency have resources which will enable it to survey the needs of the entire community. Such research is usually piecemeal and therefore relatively ineffectual. However, through community councils, schools, churches, social agencies, and government departments can cooperate in planning re-

search. Adequate factual information can be accumulated which will serve as a substantial guide for community planning.

Long-term social planning in the American community has been as lacking as physical planning. Our communities have grown up with little or no direction so far as the needs of services and agencies are concerned. Growth has been by the process of accretion rather than by orderly directed integrated expansion. The coordinating council provides the first step toward rectifying this situation. Community building would be a relatively simple process with the information we now have regarding social structure and social control. The problem, however, becomes exceedingly complicated because we are not called upon to build communities but to rebuild them. We do not start with new material and new situations, but we must begin where we are with a highly disorganized social pattern, with vested interest in property, position, and prestige, and with local traditions and national agency ties, and out of this social morass, rebuild according to some organized pattern. The materials themselves and the social problems are constantly changing.

✓ The first step in the process is an effort to coordinate the existing institutions and agencies. But this should be considered only the first step. After a substantial beginning has been made, and leadership in the community has developed a cooperative spirit, coordination should rapidly move in the direction of social planning. By this we do not mean the assumption of fixed patterns and inflexible procedures, but rather a type of planning which is a continuous process based upon a continuing study of needs and a continuing evaluation of the processes used in meeting these needs. A simple formula which has been found helpful in connection with this type of social planning may be stated in the form of three questions: (1)

What are the needs? (2) How are these needs now being met? and (3) How can these needs best be met?

The answer to the first question, "What are the needs?" involves fact-finding and research. This may best be done by members of the neighborhood or community who will eventually apply the findings in planning. Research may be more expertly done by well-trained specialists from the outside. Such studies, however, as are made by the expert often results in local resistance and resentment, and too often we have no better ultimate use for them than to augment the files. Fact-finding done by those directly concerned with the problem, such as the agencies operating in the neighborhood and interested lay people, is more likely to bring fruitful results.

The discovery of needs by this fact-finding approach leads directly to the next problem, "How are these needs now being met?" The answer involves an analysis of the community pattern at the particular time. Agencies and their resources, personnel and facilities, the type of program offered, the extent of overlapping, areas of neglect, points of tension or cooperation, need to be thrown into bold relief. Again if this is done by local leaders, both lay and professional, in a friendly spirit such as is engendered in the community council, results will be far better than if the work were done by an outsider even though he be more expert.

Formulating a Program

The next step in the process of social planning after a discovery of the needs and an evaluation of methods of meeting those needs, is formulation of the program. This involves not only drawing plans setting long-term objectives, but also carrying them out, evaluating results, and revising them in the light of experience with the particular situation.

The problem of delinquency which concerns the entire neighborhood or community may be used by way of illustration. Churches, schools, group work agencies, case work agencies, municipal departments, the home—all are concerned with delinquency. A study of the best practices in dealing with this complex problem will be helpful in the local situation. Community planning will involve a coordination of the efforts of existing agencies dealing with youth, and will necessitate the application both of group work and case work techniques.

One major reason why delinquency persists is the utter failure on the part of communities generally to coordinate the work of the schools, churches, group work agencies, municipal departments, and others dealing with youth. Wherever this has been done, results have been most gratifying, and in some cases, in a relatively short time delinquency has declined under a community program almost to the vanishing point. It is not sufficient that enough people want a particular thing in the way of social improvement. It is necessary that they act on that desire, and action will be ineffectual unless it is concerted action. An infinite number of examples may be cited where results have been achieved by group action, and endless failures may be called to mind because of lack of cooperative action.

The pattern of American community social organization is based upon institutional organization. Every great idea and every notable program for social betterment, be it religious, educational, or otherwise, sooner or later become institutionalized. Leadership within these agencies frequently becomes what may be called "institution mindedness" or "agency mindedness." Such leaders have been characterized as "institutional introverts." Their passion is of course to serve human needs, but this ultimate goal is too often eclipsed by the necessity of serving the agency.

"Agency mindedness" must be replaced by "community mindedness," where we can see life whole rather than in compartments. The schoolman has to conceive of education not simply as the program that takes place within the four walls of the classroom, but rather in terms of growth, an experience as broad as life itself. He cannot continue to confuse schooling with education, but rather he must redefine education in terms of a broader conception. Education begins at birth and continues to the end of life. It continues weekends and through summer vacations. It consists of experiences in the home, movies, press, radio, church, group work agencies, and gangs. Therefore the schoolman must look upon his institution not as a boundary which sets off education from the rest of life, but rather as the base of operations from which he shall cooperate with all other spheres of living to create an environment in which youth can grow to the full stature of worthy manhood or womanhood.

So the churchman must see religion not merely in terms of the ritual or of the experience which is peculiar to worship, but he must see religion permeating every phase of life, the market place, the school, or the golf links. If church leadership is to assume its rightful place in social planning, it must ally itself intimately and specifically with all constructive agencies operating in the community. The same is true of every agency, be it Boy Scouts, the American Legion, or the police department.

One of the major difficulties in the realization of this ideal is the nature of training for leadership. We have not only institutionalized our services, but quite naturally we have institutionalized our training for these services. In training schools for school administrators we do not deal with anything but schools, so no social leaders are produced. By what strange chance would one so trained in a limited sphere of institution administration become a

social leader? In training for leadership in the church, the same technique is largely followed. The schools of theology train, not social leaders and not even church technicians, but Methodist Church or Catholic Church or Baptist Church technicians.

The specific training is almost always in terms of the institution to be administered. We may go into other fields such as some of our group work agencies which maintain training schools to develop their own technicians. We may even dare turn to the approved schools of social work which seem to think that the salvation of the human race is by way of case work techniques or through the development of technicians in social work administration. The great need of our time is not simply for more and better trained technicians but for social leaders whose training will transcend institution boundaries. Leaders who are qualified to see life whole and who fit into the entire community picture could view specialized services in proper relationship and proper perspective. Such leaders would well qualify for the title, "social engineer."

The best investment that a community could make would be to employ a person with leadership capacity and with extensive training who could serve in the capacity of executive of the community council and leader in social planning. Current demands for this type of leadership lead us to believe that a new profession of "social engineering" is imminent.

Since the Annual Conference on Community Coordination last May in Indianapolis there have been extensive developments in community council work. A detailed report of these experiments will be given later at this conference. We may note, however, in passing, that similar trends are apparent east and west.

I am convinced after following the field of community coordination over a period of years that this approach

to meeting human needs cooperatively has unlimited possibilities. Everywhere people have come more and more to look to the state or to the Federal Government for a solution of their problems. Some things can be done best through the agencies in these larger units of our government. However, we cannot escape the obvious fact that most of our living is done in the limited area of neighborhoods. The things which affect us most intimately are the social factors in our own immediate environment, and fortunately the people in the local community exercise control to a very large degree over these local factors. If this be true, then the community coordinating council or social planning council, has within its potentialities a solution of pressing problems if these professional and lay leaders within a community work together with a single purpose of creating a social milieu in which life can find its most satisfying fruition.

In these days of unrest and insecurity, when democracies have crumbled under the impact of a totalitarian philosophy and when the very foundations of remaining democracies are being shaken, there comes a challenge to social leaders such as has not been faced in this generation. If democracy in America is to continue, it will do so not because of what happens in state or in Federal Government primarily, but because it is enthroned in the local American neighborhood and community. The coordinating council, or the social planning council, is of the very essence of democracy. It becomes the medium through which the democratic principle may be implemented in American life.



COORDINATING COUNCIL PROGRESS, 1938

Report of a National Survey of Coordinating and Neighborhood Councils

KENNETH S. BEAM

Executive Secretary, Coordinating Councils, Incorporated

THIS is the third and last of a series of reports on a national survey of coordinating and neighborhood councils under the auspices of the National Probation Association. The two previous reports have appeared in the Yearbooks of the Association for 1936 and 1937.¹ Both of these have been reported as a part of the proceedings of the National Conference on Community Coordination held in connection with the annual conference of the Association.

The two preceding reports gave considerable space to a description of these councils and their accomplishments. It will be unnecessary to repeat this information. Instead we shall turn to their problems, to suggestions for new councils, and to discussion of the future of the movement. The last topic seems particularly timely in view of the fact that with this report the movement steps out from under the parental wing of the National Probation Association and continues without their valuable sponsorship but with full cooperation.

In the spring of 1938 a questionnaire was sent to all the councils of which we had any previous knowledge. The returned questionnaires have provided a wealth of information on which to base these sections of the report.

1. *The Community Approach to Delinquency Prevention*, 1936 (155 pages); *Community Cooperation for Social Welfare*, 1937 (76 pages).

Developments During the Past Year

The number of councils continues to increase at about the same rate we have noted during the past two years. The report in 1936 had some information on approximately 250 councils. Last year the number had gone over the 300 mark. This year the number is somewhere between 350 and 380. These figures indicate only the number of councils of which we have some record. Each year we discover some councils which have been in existence for a number of years.

This past year councils have been reported for the first time from Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Rhode Island and Wisconsin. Coordinating and neighborhood councils are now found in twenty-nine states. Most councils reported this year for the first time are in states and cities where this type of organization has been functioning for several years, and most of the newly organized councils are in cities employing full time council executives.

California still heads the list with one hundred and twenty-six councils. Next in order come Washington (43), Illinois (31), New York (29), Massachusetts (23) and New Jersey (20).

Coordinating Council Executives

Twenty-eight executives are now employed to direct the work of coordinating and neighborhood councils as compared with twenty reported last year. Seven of these give only part time to the council work. Three serve under state organizations, three on a county basis, and twenty-one are employed by city organizations. One is now serving a regional organization covering the Pacific coast states. Ten of these executives are women and eighteen are men.

Of the entire group of twenty-eight council executives, eleven are employed by public departments, nine by councils of social agencies, three by private agencies, two are financed by foundations, one by a state conference of social work, one by a civic organization, and one by a W.P.A. project. It is worth noting that the three workers employed by W.P.A. last year are now regularly employed for council work, two by public departments and one by a private agency.

The difficulty of carrying on in a large city without a trained field worker is so well recognized that few attempts in this direction have been made in recent years. The writer has information regarding ten or more cities in which the decision has been made to organize councils on a neighborhood basis as soon as funds are available for the employment of a field worker.

A Recommendation to Organize Neighborhood Councils

One of the most carefully prepared statements regarding the decision to organize neighborhood councils comes from Rochester, New York. This statement was prepared by a subcommittee on neighborhood organization appointed by the Council of Social Agencies. The opening paragraph explains that a plan of community coordination along neighborhood lines has been recommended "after due consideration of the theories relevant to neighborhood organization and of the history of developments in this field both in Rochester and elsewhere."

The subcommittee preceded its formal recommendation with the following statement of basic principles:

1. That coordination of the resources within a circumscribed neighborhood may be the most effective means of attacking certain social problems of essentially neighborhood scope and character.

2. That such neighborhood organization tends to distribute responsibility for social planning by involving many individuals in the community.

3. That such neighborhood organization tends to foster a broad social awareness rather than a narrow agency or organization mindedness. ✓

4. That the sponsorship of neighborhood organization is primarily a responsibility of the Council of Social Agencies.

5. That the most effective progress will be achieved under a plan which, while permitting reasonable flexibility in its approach to the problems of particular neighborhoods, makes definite provision for inter-neighborhood coordination and integrates the program with already established media for community service.

6. That professional secretarial assistance is essential to maximum progress.

I. It is therefore recommended:

That the Council of Social Agencies undertake the sponsorship of neighborhood organization in Rochester:

1. By establishing a department of neighborhood organization whose responsibility it shall be to promote and direct the work and to outline policies pertaining thereto.

2. By appropriating funds necessary for the remuneration of secretarial personnel.

3. By providing for such clerical and other services as are necessary to the work.

II. It is further recommended:

That the department of neighborhood organization shall be established in accordance with the following plan:

1. Personnel The department shall be representative of the community's social, religious and educational agencies; it shall be composed of persons who occupy responsible positions and are conversant with the city's social problems.

2. Formation The department shall be nominated by the central planning committee and shall be elected by the board of directors of the Council of Social Agencies.

3. Function The department shall be empowered to proceed in accordance with the following purposes: to promote and direct neighborhood organization in Rochester; to outline general poli-

cies relative to the formation, personnel, autonomy and functions of neighborhood councils; provision for secretarial and clerical assistance, definition of neighborhood boundaries, publicity regarding the work; to coordinate the work of various neighborhood councils; to serve a liaison function between neighborhood councils and the Council of Social Agencies or city-wide agencies and organizations; to disburse funds necessary to the work, subject to the approval of the board of directors of the Council of Social Agencies.

These recommendations were followed by supplementary suggestions to the new department covering a definition of neighborhoods, membership in neighborhood councils, the function of neighborhood councils, headquarters, secretarial personnel, and the development of the councils.

Major Problems of Local Councils

In the questionnaire referred to in the opening paragraphs of this report one question was worded as follows: "What are some of the major problems faced by the council?"

The question gave no indication as to what types of problems were meant. It had been worded ambiguously in order that the persons answering the question might report the problems giving them the most concern whether they were problems within the community or problems of administration within the councils. The questionnaires were nearly all filled out by council chairmen.

Of the 173 answers to this question from 19 states, 116 reported on community problems and 57 on problems of organization. The community problems had to do with community conditions (41), recreation facilities needed (40), public and private services needing improvement (19) and other youth problems (16).

In organization, the problem of securing cooperation (53) stood at the head of the list, with leadership next (14), followed by problems of finances (10).

Community conditions constituting serious problems included the following, listed according to the frequency with which they were mentioned in the questionnaires: housing conditions, relief, unemployment, health hazards, liquor, the breakdown of families, gambling, undesirable commercial recreation, traffic hazards, and unregulated street trades.

Too much attention should not be given to the order in which these conditions and problems are listed. Councils are particularly concerned about conditions affecting children and youth. They are also influenced by the conditions in their particular neighborhoods receiving the most emphasis or causing the greatest concern at a particular time. This emphasis shifts from month to month. The council chairmen naturally listed the major problems their councils were facing at the time.

Recreation facilities lacking in the community received almost as much attention as all the above conditions combined. This was to be expected in view of the interest of councils in the welfare of children and youth. Conspicuously needed were: playgrounds, equipment for existing playgrounds, permanent centers with supervision the year round, longer hours, lighting of playgrounds, recreation programs in delinquency areas, community dances for young people, play spaces for small children, and meeting places "where adults can smoke and stay late." One council mentioned as their special problem, "the conservative attitude of civic leaders toward new trends in recreation."

Other services needing improvement were mentioned by nineteen councils. The councils would like to see the school buildings made available for community gatherings in the evening. They also want more courses in adult education, particularly parent education. Vocational education and placement are urged, and extension of visiting teacher service.

Other services the councils want to see supplied or improved are boys' and girls' clubs, summer camps, probation service, day nurseries, child welfare programs, church programs (as they affect children and youth) and branch libraries.

Other youth problems in addition to the foregoing have to do chiefly with unemployment. The councils are greatly concerned over the great number of young people out of school and out of work. Some councils designate youth problems as their major concern without attempting to identify the problems. Others are chiefly concerned with juvenile delinquency, sometimes confining the problem to certain age groups, certain areas, or certain types of delinquency.

Problems of Organization

In answering the question, "What are some of the major problems faced by the council?" fifty-seven chairmen listed difficulties of council organization. It is natural that a chairman's mind should turn to administration problems for the solution of which he is responsible. These have to be faced by practically all councils during their early stages.

Securing the cooperation of officials and agency heads apparently stands well at the head of the list. It is noteworthy that of the fifty-seven councils listing problems of organization, thirty-three mention securing cooperation. Of this number twenty-two record their difficulty in securing the cooperation of officials and agency heads, the professional group.

These problems include agency-minded leaders; lack of cooperation on the part of public officials, school administrators and courts; the need of cooperation between adult and youth organizations; the integration of lay and

professional interests; and the general problem of bringing together the diverse interests in the community.

Arousing the interest of the layman is mentioned as a major problem by eleven councils. Under this heading come phrases that will sound very familiar to all engaged in any type of community organization: indifference of the community at large; difficulty in arousing the interest of the local lay people; general inertia and lack of interest. It is clear from some of the questionnaires that this need is a continuing one because the chairmen refer not only to the problem of arousing the interest of the local citizen, but to the equally difficult one of sustaining that interest once it is aroused.

Leadership is of course mentioned in connection with coordinating and neighborhood councils as it would be with every other organization involving volunteers. These questionnaires have been filled out by chairmen who do not hesitate to point out the shortcomings of their own administration or those of others they have seen in office. They mention the inactive leader; lack of time on the part of the present leaders; lack of action due to poor leadership; lack of enthusiasm in the leaders; inability to make the council vital to the community; and the necessity of persistent follow-up. One report urged the leaders to promote "self-education in good procedure."

The need of paid executives was mentioned particularly by those councils not having the advantage of such guidance. Those councils benefiting by the services of full time field executives seem to have turned their attention to problems in the community rather than to problems of administration. In one instance where the councils were in danger of losing their paid executive, this threatened loss was put down as the major problem. The chief difficulty in the way of employing an executive is the lack of funds for salary.

Financial problems apparently trouble a number of councils in spite of the fact that they seldom need money for their own work. The councils become interested in community needs that cannot be met without funds. One chairman writes, "Until a plan of financing is arranged no real program of neighborhood development can be built up." Another mentions "the inability of member organizations to carry out plans of the council due to lack of funds." A number of councils have become interested in assisting in raising funds to employ directors for community centers. Several small cities and towns are endeavoring to secure trained social workers to direct a broad program of social betterment.

Suggestions to New Councils

Another of the questions asked of all councils was, "What suggestions would you give to a council just getting started?" A number of councils begged off from this question, claiming that they had not had enough experience and that they were in no position to give advice. Others thought the question could not be answered unless they knew something about the community preparing to organize a council. But a total of seventy-eight suggestions were made which should prove exceedingly helpful to new councils. Since these suggestions were not directed at specific councils, they have the aspect of principles and methods applying to most councils regardless of location.

Membership Of the seventy-eight suggestions made, twenty-one, the largest number centering on one subject, had to do with membership. This is interesting in view of the fact that among the major problems listed in the preceding section the difficulty of securing full cooperation ranked high. Apparently the councils feel that there is a way of securing cooperation through a certain technique in building up council membership.

It would seem that in starting a council one should concentrate on a few interested individuals rather than try to form an organization with a large number of people. As the program of the council is interpreted through these individuals, other members can be gradually brought in. *Wahkiakum County, Washington*

Start with a very small group, then increase by inviting representatives from each organization in community. *Cardiff, San Diego, California*

Have a small number in the council, not more than eighteen, each member representing a different interest in the community of vital interest to youth. *Midland, Michigan*

Start with a small group and work for the confidence of the community. *Yonkers, New York*

Sell the idea and real need to three people who will devote their time and efforts, and the job is begun. *Queen Anne, Seattle, Washington*

Interest as many [as possible] of the executives of state, city, or other subdivisions in active participation. *North End, Boston, Massachusetts*

Make sure that each agency in your community is represented, and meet regularly each month. *West End, Boston, Massachusetts*

Take plenty of time to secure good representation from each member organization. *Burbank, California*

Laymen, especially business men of the neighborhood, would be a valuable addition to the councils' mind and work. *Fort Washington, Cincinnati, Ohio*

Be sure the interest of citizens of the community is behind the formation of a council. *Sycamore-Woodward, Cincinnati, Ohio*

Include in your membership as many private, public, civic, religious, and industrial or commercial agencies as possible. *North East, Cleveland, Ohio*

Get young people on the committees. *Roosevelt, Seattle, Washington*

Get all the social groups, schools, police, church, and welfare agencies together to face some of the community problems. *Southwest, Washington, D. C.*

Secure the broad inclusive participation of all possible interests and agencies. *First Ward, Washington, D. C.*

Secure representation from all social forces in the community. *Richmond, Virginia*

Secure representation from all public and private agencies, and work very closely with the law enforcement bodies. *Dallas, Texas.*

[Enlist] cooperation of each organization doing any kind of welfare work. *Walla Walla, Washington*

Include in membership the peoples' groups, so that the council is not superimposed on a community. *Yonkerville, New York.*

Secure strong lay interest. *Georgetown, Washington, D. C.*

Secure an active and discriminating membership chairman. *Northeast, Washington, D. C.*

The Program Seventeen council chairmen put their emphasis on the council program, particularly the method of launching the program. They had apparently learned from experience that council members expect results and that they cannot get results in the beginning unless they put the entire weight of the council back of one vital project.

Study the community, find actual needs, then select one need and meet it. *Arden Road, Chicago, Illinois.*

Find a vital, basic need, and concentrate all efforts to fill that particular need. *Sherwood Park, Yonkers, New York*

Start work immediately on some problem, however small, which can show tangible results. *Northeast, Washington, D. C.*

Begin with a small group attacking a definite project, one that can be completed within a reasonable time, so that interest can be maintained. *Southgate, California.*

Begin on simple projects on which there is likelihood of success, then take up long-time problems. *School 12, Yonkers, New York*

Start at first a really worth while project that gives promise of removing an unwholesome influence. *Long Beach, California.*

Have a specific and urgent influence. *Indianapolis, Indiana*

Develop a small but definite program around a specific task to be carried out. *South End, Chicago, Illinois*

Have something definite to work for. *Northeast, Portland, Oregon*

Agree as to the most important problems confronting the community, then get to work. *Lincoln Heights, Los Angeles, California*

Select needs that are most urgent. *Potrero, San Francisco, California*

Have something definite to do. Let the thing grow from a small beginning. *Stock Yards, Chicago, Illinois*

Have very definite objectives, and work hard. *San Dimas, California*

Go slow. Analyze needs, but do not expect to accomplish everything at once. *El Sereno, California*

Do not attack too many problems. *Huntington Park, California*

Select problems that are near and vital to every one in the group. *Chelsea, New York City*

Limit the scope of the project to that which can be done well. Expand as resources and understanding permit. *Salt Lake City*

Surveys It is clear from the suggestions in the preceding section that the adoption of a program adapted to the needs of the community depends on a survey of community problems, needs, and resources.

The council's first activity should be to study the neighborhood from the social standpoint. This survey of resources will not only give every member of the council a definite function to perform, it will be of value in providing a basis for the council's program. *Central, Washington, D. C.*

Emphasize the need for a survey before the program is planned. *Salt Lake City, Utah*

Have a thorough survey to find facts before starting. *Inglewood, Chicago, Illinois*

The council should make an objective survey of the social problems in the neighborhood, working with a central planning agency. *Syracuse, New York*

Keep councils well informed through participation in social studies which interpret the unmet needs of their own communities and their relation to the community needs. *Richmond, Virginia*

Start with an intensive study of community needs and agencies. *Georgetown, Washington, D. C.*

Study first the district. *Yorkville, New York City*

Definite understanding of community problems must precede program building. *West Side, Kansas City, Missouri*

Become familiar with the scope and procedure of the co-operating agencies. *Huntington Park, California*

Leadership. In view of the fact that among the major problems a number of councils mentioned securing good leaders, it is not surprising that we find the chairmen of older councils warning those entering this field to be exceedingly careful in their choice of council officers.

Choose the most outstanding leaders as your founders. Never allow politics to enter. *Hazelwood, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*

Select a chairman who will lead from a community angle, not a church or a P.T.A. point of view. *Alameda-Main, Los Angeles, California*

Have a chairman and executive committee who are not only capable and energetic, but well known in the community. Be cautious lest you have publicity seekers. *Long Beach, California*

Be sure you have trained leadership. Be prepared for a long time siege. Don't expect a bed of roses. Be objective about your work. Avoid politics. *Hastings, New York*

See that officers and chairman are willing to work, and work hard. *Greenwood-Phinney, Seattle, Washington*

If they don't want a lot of hard work without pay, or if they are not able to give a lot of free time, don't organize—*Chatham Grand Crossing, Chesterfield-Avalon Stony Island Park, Chicago, Illinois*

Paid Executives Under this heading also we find a repetition of emphasis on the importance of a paid secretary.

Insist on the employment of a paid director. *Stanyan, San Francisco, California*

A trained leader is needed to do the neighborhood organizing. *Syracuse, New York*

It would be an advantage to start out with a paid director. *Springfield, Illinois*

Get a paid executive as soon as possible. *Salt Lake City, Utah*

Have an active paid worker as contact person on the job full time. *Point Loma, San Diego, California*

A large community should have a paid secretary. *San Dimas, California*

[A council] needs funds for a full time secretary. *Hyde Park-Kenwood-Oakland, Chicago, Illinois*

An additional worker [is needed] who will devote more time and energy to the work. *Germantown, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*

Provide a secretary with sufficient funds to keep activities before membership and public. *Glendora, California*

Keep the Public Informed There will be differences of opinion regarding the degree and kind of publicity that should be given coordinating and neighborhood councils. In the following suggestions it should be noted that the type of publicity recommended has to do with community needs rather than with the work of the council itself.

Give publicity to community needs in order to arouse the interest among community organizations. *Fort Bragg, California*

Acquainting the public is important, getting its confidence and cooperation. *Durham, North Carolina*

The press, the governmental and private agencies must be with you, the community must have confidence in you. *Hastings, New York*

Get the backing of the entire population as quickly as possible. *Highland Park, Louisville, Kentucky*

Educate the people to the need for a broader development of community projects, without undermining or criticising too pointedly the work already accomplished. *Beverly Hills, California*

Impress on the community that the council is one of coordination, and will sponsor projects intended to reduce juvenile delinquency, but only when and until a responsible agency is ready to assume responsibility. *Long Beach, California*

An educational program to acquaint the public with council fundamentals is most essential. *Wilmington, California*

Council Meetings, Committees, Policies Under this last heading is grouped a number of suggestions which should be much more adequately developed in later studies.

Be sure to have thorough preparation of interesting programs for every announced meeting. *First Ward, Washington, D. C.*

Have a definite program of interest at each meeting. *Wahkiakum County, Washington*

Have informative programs related to problems in the community. *Northeast, Washington, D. C.*

Establish committees only as there is a need felt for them and definite projects for them to work on. *Yakima, Washington*

I should be inclined to have committees work on specific projects as a preparatory experience to council organization. *Alta House, Cleveland, Ohio*

Every representative should have some part in the organization. *East Los Angeles, California*

Do not have one pattern for all neighborhoods—fit the plan to the neighborhood. *Des Moines, Iowa*

Avoid taking authority and responsibility for initiating and carrying on activities in the name of the council. *Berkeley, California*

Talk things over and then talk some more. Where workers and executives of agencies get to know each other as individuals they can together see the total job to be done by all social workers and see beyond their own "area of competence." *West Side, Cleveland, Ohio*

Cultivate patience. *Garfield, Seattle, Washington*

The Future of the Movement

The interest in community coordination becomes more pronounced from year to year. It has developed in different sections of the country at approximately the same time. It has received its stimulus from differing conditions, problems, and events. Its leadership has come from different fields—from education, religion, probation, from many public departments, from private social agencies, and from the citizens themselves.

The movement does not need promotion. It is self-promoting in that the news of the successes of one council spread to the neighboring communities. The difficulty is not in the spread of the idea but in the dissemination of

accurate information regarding the requisites for success. Many conditions have to be met before a coordinating or neighborhood council can achieve the results anticipated by the organizers. It is for this reason that so much space has been given in this report to the problems involved and to suggestions from the older councils to those just entering this field. There is need for a permanent clearing house of information so that those desiring advice and information can receive it without loss of time.

The National Advisory Committee on Coordinating Councils was formed at the time of the Attorney General's Conference on Crime in December 1934. In December of the following year the National Probation Association began its study of the movement, and for the first time brought scattered councils in touch with each other through field visits, a series of three national conferences, and the publication of the proceedings of those conferences. The service rendered this movement by the National Probation Association during the years 1936 to 1938 can scarcely be overestimated. This service is particularly commendable in view of the fact that at no time did the National Probation Association expect to make this survey and consultant service a permanent part of its program, but rather wanted to accumulate as much information about it as possible because of the delinquency prevention emphasis of many of the original councils.

National Committee on Community Coordination In April 1937 the National Social Work Council appointed a National Committee on Community Coordination. This committee succeeded the one appointed at the time of the Attorney General's Conference on Crime and carried over with it almost the entire membership of the former committee. The committee is without funds but it renders a real service through the opportunity it provides for the

various national organizations interested in the movement to keep in touch with each other and with the movement itself, and to make plans for some form of service to the councils. This committee persuaded the National Probation Association to continue its study and service beyond the period originally planned.

At the meeting of this committee at Seattle on June 27, 1938, two significant steps were taken. The committee plans to prepare a statement regarding the assistance available from all national organizations for those communities desiring advice. They also decided to see what could be done toward finding a substitute for the National Conference on Community Coordination that has been provided the last three years by the National Probation Association. This conference has been held in connection with the regular annual conference of the Association during those years when the Association was serving the movement in a variety of ways.

The third National Conference on Community Coordination was held in Seattle June 26 and 27, 1938.¹

Coordinating Councils, Incorporated At the meetings held in Seattle, announcement was made of the formation of a new organization known as Coordinating Councils, Incorporated, "a research and service organization for the advancement of community coordination." This organization was incorporated under the laws of California, March 29, 1938. It will maintain headquarters temporarily in the same office with the Los Angeles County Coordinating Councils. The executive secretary will use the headquarters of the San Francisco Coordinating Councils while in northern California. The new organization is financed by the Rosenberg Foundation, San Francisco. It will confine its work throughout the balance

1. An account of the meetings and report of the discussion will be found in the *Coordinating Council Bulletin*, published by the Los Angeles County Coordinating Councils, for July 1938.

of 1938 to California, with hopes of extending its services to other western states later.

The organization is launching a program of field service, research, publications, and regional conferences. The *Coordinating Council Bulletin*, published for the last six years by the Los Angeles County Coordinating Councils, will be taken over by the new organization and expanded. This publication will gather information from councils all over the United States and in this way will serve as a unifying medium for the entire movement.

The Demand for a Pattern Coordinating and neighborhood councils are made up for the most part of people occupied in other work and deeply interested in one or more other organizations. They can give only a fraction of their time to cooperative effort. To make this time of real value, and to accomplish real results, the council members welcome all the expert advice that can be provided. They want to know exactly what to do, when to do it, and how to do it. When suggestions are given they are followed very closely, almost too closely sometimes. This tendency has been encouraged by the fact that many council members are identified with national organizations which supply them with specific instructions regarding many details of their work. When such detailed instructions are not found in connection with their coordinating council work they are at a loss as to how to proceed.

Of course no exact pattern can be provided for coordinating councils, since each community must work out its own form of organization, make its own studies and develop its own program. However, there is much information in circulation that should be made available in concise form. This is one of the greatest needs of the movement at this time. The first attempt to meet this need was made by the National Probation Association when they published the small booklet, *Coordinating Councils*,

How Shall They Be Organized? The California State Department of Education will produce a booklet in the fall of 1938, which is intended to meet this need as far as the California councils are concerned, and should be of value to the movement as a whole.

The executives of coordinating and neighborhood councils meeting in Seattle requested Coordinating Councils, Incorporated to circulate another questionnaire in the spring of 1939 to all councils in the country and to prepare a report on the information received. Perhaps this questionnaire will draw ideas from many councils as to the material they would like to see in such a publication.

The Ideal Combination. The importance of having trained executives to direct the work of coordinating councils is well recognized. It is also generally recognized that one executive can serve several councils, but there is some difference of opinion as to the number of councils one secretary can serve satisfactorily. Opinion also varies as to the size of a council district, or the population that lends itself best to a cooperative attack on community problems. Several experiments are under way both in the East and in the West, in which towns of a few thousand people and small neighborhoods in large cities are making remarkable headway under the leadership of part time or full time executives. The accomplishments of these councils seem to us so significant as to indicate reduction of the size of council districts wherever possible with as much expert direction as possible. It may be that we can evolve a type of social engineer working on a neighborhood basis with the full backing of the community, who can accomplish much more and at less expense than we have been able to accomplish under any other system heretofore.

IX LEGAL DIGEST



Legislation and Decisions Affecting Probation and Juvenile Courts, 1938

GILBERT COSULICH

Legal Research Assistant, National Probation Association

PROBATION marches on. Although the legislatures of only nine states held regular sessions during 1938, there were enacted a number of important laws designed to prevent and to correct, by scientific and socialized methods, the evils of juvenile delinquency and adult crime.

Congress set the pace by passing two statutes providing special court procedure for youthful offenders in United States courts. One was the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia and the other, applicable to federal courts throughout the nation, was the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act.

Kentucky legislated to extend its probation service, both juvenile and adult. Massachusetts further liberalized its already advanced laws dealing with the admissibility of juvenile court records in other proceedings. New York enlarged the powers of the Onondaga County Children's Court. Mississippi enacted a limited law to strengthen its juvenile courts. Georgia, with its new statute authorizing state supervision for all adult probationers and parolees, was another state to quicken its step in the probation parade.

During 1938 the legislatures of two additional states passed enabling acts authorizing their respective governors to sign an interstate compact for the supervision of probationers and parolees. The two states were Louis-

iana (Acts of 1938, No. 168) and Virginia (Laws of 1938, c. 444). Up to the end of 1937, 23 states had passed the Uniform Act for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers. In addition, seven other states have passed independent legislation authorizing compacts.

Acknowledgment is again due for the cooperation tendered by the Bar Association of the City of New York, through Franklin O. Poole, librarian.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA On June 1, 1938, the President of the United States signed an act of Congress to reorganize the juvenile court for the District. The new law applies to all children under the age of eighteen and to those under the age of twenty-one who are charged with having violated any law prior to having reached eighteen. The Act contains, in general, the salient provisions of the standard act of the National Probation Association, such as those dealing with jurisdiction over both children and adults, detention, conduct of hearings, appeals, and other procedural details. Unlike the standard act, however, the cooperation of the corporation counsel or his assistant is required in approving petitions, and a jury trial may be had in juvenile cases if "demanded by the child, his parents or guardian or the court." It is provided that the judge shall appoint from civil service eligibility lists a director of social work, a supervisor of probation, probation officers, "and such other employees as may be necessary at such salaries as may be fixed in accordance with the classification act of 1923," etc. (Public No. 571 c. 309, 75 Congress)

GEORGIA The name of the State Prison Commission was changed to the State Prison and Parole Commission. The new Commission is charged with providing adequate supervision for all adult probationers and parolees. (Laws of 1938, No. 299)

KENTUCKY In counties having a city of the second class, the county courts, sitting as juvenile tribunals, are empowered to appoint a chief probation officer at a salary of not more than \$2400, and one or more assistant probation officers, one of whom may receive not more than \$1200, and each of the others not more than \$1000, such salaries to be fixed by the county judge. By the same statute, in counties having a city of the first class, the county judge may appoint a chief probation officer at a salary of not less than \$4000 nor more than \$5000, to be fixed by the fiscal court; one or more assistant probation officers, two of whom shall receive a salary of not more than \$2400 each, and all other assistant probation officers a salary of not more than \$1800, to be fixed by the fiscal court. In counties having a city of the first class, a "Merit Board of the Juvenile Court," composed of four members appointed by the county judge from a list of fifteen citizens submitted by the County Council of Social Agencies, conducts competitive examinations and certifies an eligible list of candidates from which probation officers are appointed by the county judge. (Acts of 1938, First Extraordinary Session, c. 37) This statute however was declared unconstitutional. (*Beauchamp v. Silk*, 120 S.W. 2d 765, decided October 21, 1938)

Police courts in cities of the second class are empowered to put on probation defendants not previously convicted of a felony, and to appoint a probation officer at a salary of not less than \$1200 nor more than \$1800 to be fixed by the court and to be paid only out of the funds and forfeitures collected by the police court. The board of commissioners or city council may by ordinance provide that a regular city police officer may act as probation officer without additional pay. (Acts of 1938, First Extraordinary Session, c. 35)

MASSACHUSETTS Upon request by the probate court, probation officers must make investigations and written reports in "separate support" proceedings. (Acts of 1938, c. 136)

Before imposing sentence upon a person for operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated, a court must inquire of the Board of Probation whether it has any records showing that the defendant has been convicted of a like offense within six years immediately preceding the commission of the offense with which he is charged. (Acts of 1938, c. 145)

An adjudication or disposition of a child as wayward or delinquent, or any record pertaining thereto, shall not be received as evidence in any court, except in subsequent proceedings for waywardness or delinquency against the same child and except in imposing sentence in any criminal proceeding against the same person. The records of the juvenile court, or of the superior court on appeal, shall be withheld from public inspection except with the consent of the court, and except also as to inspection by the child, his parents, guardian and attorney. No question regarding any offense committed before the age of sixteen, or regarding any act of waywardness or delinquency committed before the age of seventeen, must be asked in connection with any application for public office. Probation officers' records shall be open to inspection by police officials, except that in waywardness and delinquency cases such records shall not be available except with the consent of the court. This new statute considerably amplifies and liberalizes the preexisting laws on the subject, including General Laws, c. 119, sec. 60, dealing with the admissibility of juvenile court records as evidence in subsequent proceedings. (Acts of 1938, c. 174)

MISSISSIPPI By an amendment to the code, in counties having two cities each with a population of more than

10,000, the chancellor, when requested by the board of supervisors, must appoint an assistant juvenile probation officer, in addition to the chief probation officer already provided for by law. (General Laws of 1938, c. 307)

NEW JERSEY The commission to investigate juvenile delinquency was continued to June 5, 1939, and an appropriation of \$20,000 was voted to enable it to carry on its work. (Laws of 1938, c. 326)

NEW YORK The Children's Court Act of Onondaga County was amended in the following respects: the court's jurisdiction in adoption proceedings was made concurrent with that of the surrogate's court; the children's court was given such additional jurisdiction as is granted to county and inferior criminal courts, to the end that the Onondaga Children's Court, in carrying out the purposes of the statute creating it, would not be limited to the jurisdiction granted to children's courts constituted solely as such; and the court was empowered to try adult cases coming within its jurisdiction with or without a jury, the number of jurors being prescribed as six. (Laws of 1938, c. 52)

Chapter 354 of the Laws of 1917, establishing a Board of Child Welfare for Dutchess County, was repealed. The abrogated law gave the County Board of Child Welfare authority to receive as public charges on the county all delinquent children committed by the children's court unless they were sent to a state institution, and to do other work with juvenile delinquents. The repealed act also abolished the preexisting Board of Child Welfare. (Laws of 1938, c. 45)

A joint legislative commission, created in 1937, on children's court jurisdiction and juvenile delinquency, held hearings during the year, particularly on the question of

increasing the age jurisdiction of children's courts from sixteen to eighteen. The commission is scheduled to submit its final report to the legislature on February 15, 1939.

OHIO In any case where a common pleas court, or other court having jurisdiction, has made an award of the custody or an order for the support of a minor child, such court may certify the case to the juvenile court of any county for further proceedings according to law, and thereupon the jurisdiction of the adult court shall cease. (Laws of 1938, Second Special Session, S.B. 396)

SOUTH CAROLINA An amendment to the act creating a domestic relations court in all counties having a city of 60,000 population (Charleston County) increased the salary of the clerk of the court from \$1200 to \$1500 per annum and that of the probation officer from \$1500 to \$1800. Both their tenures of office are now subject to the pleasure of the judge of said court in lieu of the former term of two years each. (Acts of 1938, No. 678)

VIRGINIA The act providing for probation and suspension of sentences was amended so as to authorize the court to suspend the unserved portion of a misdemeanor sentence after the defendant has commenced serving such sentence. This is tantamount to judicial parole. (Acts of 1938, c. 122)

UNITED STATES COURTS The Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act was signed by the President of the United States on June 16, 1938. It applies to all persons seventeen years of age or under, and to all offenses not punishable by death or life imprisonment. The new law provides that a juvenile offender not surrendered to the authorities of any state pursuant to the provisions of the

act of 1932 shall be "prosecuted" as a juvenile delinquent if the Attorney General so directs and the "accused" consents in writing. The child is "prosecuted by information on the charge of juvenile delinquency," and trial is without a jury. In the event that the court finds the child "guilty of juvenile delinquency" it may place him on probation for a period of five years, except that the period must not exceed the delinquent's minority or the term for which he could have been sentenced if he had been convicted as an adult. The Attorney General may designate any public or private agency for the care of the committed delinquent. When a child is arrested, the arresting officer must immediately notify the Attorney General. The alleged offender must be detained in "such juvenile home or other suitable place of detention as the Attorney General may designate," but not in a jail, unless in the opinion of the arresting officer such detention is necessary to secure the child's custody, his safety or that of others. A child detained in a jail or similar institution must be lodged in a room apart from adults "if facilities for such segregation are available." A delinquent who has been committed to an institution may be paroled by the Board of Parole. This new statute does not apply to the District of Columbia (which see in this summary). (52 Stat. 764, c. 486)

United States probation officers may be allowed, in lieu of actual expenses of transportation, not to exceed three cents per mile for the use of their own automobiles for transportation when traveling on official business within the city limits of their official station. (52 Stat. 264, c. 180)

The Supreme Court extended the rule laid down in *Frad v. Kelly*, 302 U. S. 312, 315-316, and held that the trial court may suspend the imposition of sentence on one count of an indictment and at the same time sentence the

defendant to imprisonment on another count of the same indictment. (*United States v. Cosman*, 303, U.S. 617, decided February 7, 1938). In *Frad v. Kelly*, *supra*, the court had held that the trial judge may suspend the imposition of sentence on pleas of guilty to two indictments and place the defendant on probation, effective after he has served a sentence on a third indictment.



Interstate Compacts for Probation and Parole

JOSEPH P. MURPHY

*Chief Probation Officer, Essex County, Newark,
New Jersey*

THE increasing mobility of our population has created many serious problems in the administration of justice and led to much criticism of our courts and penal and correctional agencies. State boundaries easy to cross create at once legal barriers which frequently operate to defeat justice, to aid the unscrupulous probationer or parolee to defy the court or penal authorities, and to prevent returning such offenders to their home jurisdictions or the places where they are legally answerable for their crimes.

It frequently happens that a parolee or probationer has a legitimate reason for going either temporarily or permanently into another state, but supervision by the responsible officer in the man's home community becomes difficult if not impossible when personal contact can no longer be made. Unemployed young offenders, fathers of families in search of employment or transferred to other states by their employers, or men and women under the supervision of the court who would be better off for reasons of health or a family situation in another state complicate this problem of long distance supervision.

To meet this need a federal law was passed in 1934, authorizing interstate compacts permitting states to make mutual agreements to handle such problems. Following preliminary discussions at the sessions of the American Prison Association and the Central States Probation and Parole Conference, and due to active work by the Interstate Commission on Crime, thirty-two states have now

enacted statutes authorizing interstate compacts on probation and parole and twenty-three states have signed and ratified such compacts.

To make such compacts effective, however, the administrators appointed by the respective governors must adopt rules and regulations establishing the procedures under which probation and parole officers must function in interstate action. Tentative rules and regulations were prepared by the Interstate Commission on Crime and submitted to the National Probation Association and the American Parole Association meeting at Philadelphia in October 1937. A committee to cooperate with the Interstate Commission on Crime in perfecting the probation rules was appointed by the National Probation Association, consisting of the writer as chairman and leading state and local probation executives from various parts of the country. The American Parole Association also appointed a committee on parole rules of which Arthur C. Lindholm was the active chairman. These committees prepared separate sets of rules to regulate procedure under the interstate probation and parole compacts. These rules were presented, revised and adopted for recommendation to the state administrators at a meeting of the Interstate Commission on Crime held in Cleveland, Ohio, on July 22, 1938. The rules now being submitted for adoption to the states signatory to the compact are as follows:

PREAMBLE

The purpose of these rules is to implement the interstate compacts relating to supervision of outstate parolees and probationers and their return to the sending state for violation of the terms of their parole or probation, to the end that uniformity of out-of-state procedures may be established by the states signatory to the compact.

DEFINITIONS

The term "sending state" to be hereafter used in these rules and regulations shall refer to the state in which is located the judicial or administrative authority which desires to grant permission to a parolee or probationer to move to or reside in a state other than the state in which he has been or is about to be placed under supervision.

The term "receiving state" to be hereafter used in these rules and regulations shall refer to the state into which the parolee or probationer desires to move or already has moved.

PART I—PAROLE

SECTION I

Wherever practical a single state agency shall represent the state in dealing with other states under the compact and all correspondence and communications relating to matters arising under the compact and under these rules and regulations shall be conducted with such agencies. Where there are several agencies having coordinated jurisdiction, respective states in such event will work out such methods of intercommunication and procedure as may be practical and expedient.

SECTION II

The forms¹ in reference to (1) *Request for Investigation* by sending state, (2) *Report of Investigation* by receiving state, (3) *Agreement of Parolee*, (4) *Information when Parolee is sent to receiving state*, (5) *Arrival Report*² and (6) *Reports of Progress and Attitude of Parolee* are hereto attached and hereby made part of these rules and regulations and are to be used for the purposes indicated by the signatory states.

SECTION III

The receiving state shall, preferably on the first Monday of January, April, July, and October of each year, send to the

1. The forms are too lengthy to be published here but copies may be secured from the National Probation Association on request.

2. Use customary form of sending state.

sending state a quarterly progress report in reference to the parolee, and such reports shall cover present residence of the parolee, name of employer, type and character of employment, and the parolee's general conduct and progress, as well as his attitude towards supervision. Such reports, however, shall not be a substitute for financial or other written reports the sending state may require the parolee to send at periodic intervals on such forms as it may furnish the parolee.

The foregoing, however, is not to be construed as preventing two or more states signatory hereto from agreeing among themselves for more frequent reporting concerning their respective parolees.

SECTION IV

The same standards of supervision as apply in the receiving state in the supervision of its own parolees shall apply to out-of-state parolees sent there under the terms of this agreement, and such out-of-state parolees shall, as far as practical, in all respects be subject to the same disciplinary treatment as the receiving state applies to its own parolees, and the receiving state is authorized in appropriate cases to grant to the parolee permission to make temporary visits out of the receiving state, not exceeding fifteen days.

SECTION V

Violation Reports The receiving state shall promptly upon a parole violation notify the sending state. Such reports shall specify in detail the violation, and if a crime has been committed shall, wherever possible, give both the official and the parolee's version of the act. Wherever practical it should be accompanied by a recommendation of the receiving state. In returning said parolee the receiving state shall cooperate with the sending state in retaking the parolee.

SECTION VI

Upon request of the sending state for a progress report with recommendation prior to consideration of the case for discharge, the receiving state shall prepare and transmit such report. In

cases where there has been a discharge from parole or a change in the status of the parolee the sending state shall forthwith notify the receiving state of such change.

SECTION VII

All monies which the sending state desires to collect from the parolee, either for restitution or otherwise, are to be sent directly by the parolee to the sending state and the receiving state agrees only to use its best endeavor to see that the parolee sends to the sending state such monies.

SECTION VIII

A committee of seven members (each regional parole conference nominating not less than one member on such committee) shall be elected annually by the states signatory to the interstate compact at the time of the annual meeting of the American Prison Association and the duties of such committee shall from time to time be to formulate such amendments to these rules as may be deemed necessary. The adoption of such amendments by three fifths of the duly designated officers of the compact states shall make them a part of these rules and regulations.

SECTION IX

The ratification of the foregoing rules by three fifths of the signatory states shall constitute the adoption thereof and they shall be in full force and effect as of such date.

PART II—PROBATION

SECTION I

Whenever practical, a central state probation agency shall represent the state in dealing with other states under the compact, and when so designated all correspondence and communications relating to matters arising under the compact shall be conducted with such agency. However, in states where no central state probation agency has been established to administer or supervise

probation, or where there are several state or local probation agencies of coordinate or independent jurisdiction, or wherever the geographical proximity of large cities or counties makes such action advisable or necessary, the appropriate judicial or administrative authorities of the respective states may work out the necessary methods of intercommunication and procedure to properly carry out provisions of the compact. When so acting, correspondence and communications relating to the compact should be conducted with such agencies.

SECTION II

The forms in reference to (1) *Request for Investigation* by sending state or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, (2) *Report of Inquiry* by receiving state, (3) *Agreement to Return* by probationer, (4) *Social and Legal History Concerning Probationer* to be sent to receiving state, (5) *Arrival Report*, (6) *Progress Report*, are hereto attached¹ and hereby made part of these rules and regulations, and these forms or other forms containing equivalent information as agreed upon by signatory states shall be used for the purpose indicated by the signatory states, or the appropriate judicial or administrative authorities thereof.

SECTION III

The receiving state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, shall, preferably on the first Monday in January, April, July, and October of each year, send a quarterly progress report to the sending state or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, concerning the probationer, and all such reports shall include: place or places of residence during period covered by report, name or names of employers, type and character of employment, approximate income, and probationer's attitude and general conduct and progress. Such reports, however, shall not be a substitute for financial or other written reports which the sending state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority

1. The forms are too lengthy to be published here but copies will be sent on request.

thereof, may require the probationer to send, at periodical intervals, on such forms as it may furnish the probationer.

The foregoing, however, is not to be construed as preventing two or more states, signatory hereto, or appropriate judicial or administrative authorities thereof, from agreeing among themselves upon more frequent reporting by their respective probationers.

SECTION IV

The same standards of supervision as apply in the receiving state in the supervision of its own probationers shall apply to out-of-state probationers sent there under the terms of this agreement, and such out-of-state probationers shall, as far as practical, be subject in all respects to the same disciplinary treatment as the receiving state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, applies to its own probationers, and the receiving state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, is authorized in appropriate cases to grant to probationers permission to make temporary visits out of the receiving state.

SECTION V

Reports of Violation of Probationary Conditions The receiving state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, shall promptly, upon receiving notice of a violation of the conditions of probation or rules and regulations concerning this agreement, notify the sending state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof. Such reports shall specify in detail the violation, and if a crime has been committed shall, wherever possible, give both the official and the probationer's version of the situation. Whenever practical it should be accompanied by a recommendation of the receiving state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof. Whenever and if a probationer is to be returned to his or her original jurisdiction, the receiving state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, shall cooperate with the sending state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, in retaking the probationer.

SECTION VI

Upon request of the sending state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, for a progress report with recommendation prior to consideration of the probationer for discharge, the receiving state or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, shall prepare and transmit such report. In cases where there has been a discharge from probation or a change in the status of the probationer, the sending state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, shall forthwith notify the receiving state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, of such change.

SECTION VII

All monies which the sending state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, desires to collect from probationers for family support, support of children, restitution, reparation, costs of court, or fines, are to be sent directly to the sending state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, and the receiving state, or appropriate judicial or administrative authority thereof, agrees only to use its best endeavor to see that the probationer sends such monies as are requested.

SECTION VIII

Amendments to or changes in these rules and regulations may from time to time be formulated and adopted when agreed to by three fifths of the administrators of the states signatory to the compact. It is desirable that amendments and changes be made only after adequate study and consideration has been given to the subject by the proper judicial or administrative authorities within the respective states.

SECTION IX

The foregoing rules and regulations shall be effective for and among such signatory states as shall adopt them.



Canadian Juvenile Court Laws

HELEN GREGORY MACGILL

Judge, Juvenile Court, Vancouver, B. C.

AMERICAN and Canadian authorities agree in general as to the purpose and function of juvenile courts, but laws and procedure in the two countries differ due to dissimilarities in the national constitutions.

The British North America Act of 1871 under which the provinces federated into the Dominion of Canada fixed the respective fields of federal and provincial jurisdiction. Federal parliament has exclusive jurisdiction in matters of crime: provincial legislatures have jurisdiction over the civil status of their citizens and the constitution of civil and criminal courts. Therefore children charged with offenses or crimes must be dealt with under Dominion legislation but the courts in which they are tried must be established by provincial statute. The Dominion Parliament enacted the first Juvenile Delinquents Act in 1908 and later strengthened it by amendments. This being federal legislation, it is in effect throughout the Dominion wherever juvenile courts are set up and covers children regardless of the offense or crime charged. Juvenile courts may be established in any province by the passing of a provincial juvenile court act.¹

One of the strongest features of Canadian juvenile delinquency legislation is that its field covers the whole of Canada. While to draft statutes keeping within the appropriate jurisdictions is difficult, nevertheless there are

1. While the federal act is not directly valuable in a province until that province has passed a juvenile court act of its own, nevertheless, owing to the federal nature of the Juvenile Delinquents Act, its provisions are effective in matters concerning delinquents from outside provinces. Prince Edward Island is the only Canadian province which has not passed a provincial act.

certain advantages in having one act applicable to children throughout the Dominion. The provincial juvenile courts are limited to their own jurisdiction, but the federal act in certain circumstances extends their reach to the whole Dominion.

The federal act gives juvenile courts exclusive jurisdiction in the case of all offenders under sixteen years of age.¹ Thus the child appears before the juvenile court whether the alleged infraction is of a federal or provincial statute, a municipal by-law or ordinance. Canadian procedure in taking all delinquent children, regardless of the offense or crime, into the juvenile court has an advantage over the procedure in the United States, where for federal offenses the delinquent may be tried in the federal court,² and in many states children charged with the most serious crimes are tried in the adult criminal courts. In the latter case the child is often subjected to the same treatment as the adult offender, exposed to contact with hardened criminals, stigmatized with a criminal record, and afforded no protection from publicity. He is robbed of the benefits of social investigation and supervised probation in the juvenile court.³ These evils are recognized by many American judges and various subterfuges are adopted whereby the child is transferred to the protective environment of the juvenile court.

The Canadian federal act gives the juvenile court exclusive jurisdiction, so that delinquents brought before a police magistrate or a justice of the peace are transferred to the juvenile court. Unfortunately, however, there is a loophole: those over fourteen years of age charged with indictable offenses may be transferred on the order

1. A province may raise this age to eighteen years by proclamation. Manitoba has done so and British Columbia did so in 1922.

2. Editor's note: See "The Child in the Federal Court" by Richard A. Chappell, page 204.

3. Editor's note: In many adult courts a competent probation department makes a social investigation before disposition is made and supervises the youth if he is placed on probation.

of a juvenile court judge to the criminal court for trial. This provision of the law tempts juvenile court judges to rid themselves of troublesome offenders by passing them on to the adult court.

The act also provides that those adjudged delinquent may remain under court supervision until twenty-one years old unless discharged by the court. But if such delinquents are charged with a fresh offense after reaching the age of eighteen, both adult and juvenile courts have jurisdiction. These offenders may then be dealt with as unsatisfactory probationers of the juvenile court or they may be tried in the adult court. One way of removing this double jurisdiction is to raise the age of juvenile delinquency to twenty-one. In some American juvenile courts twenty-one years is already the age limit, although in no state is juvenile court jurisdiction exclusive beyond the age of eighteen.

A notable feature of the Canadian act is the protection from publicity afforded the proceedings of the juvenile court. Except by special leave of the judge, publication is prohibited anywhere in Canada of information indicating in any way the identity of the offenders, parents, guardians, or the school or institution with which the delinquent is connected. Here again the dominion-wide character of the act is of value. In the United States while publication in the place where the court is located may be forbidden, the information may be published elsewhere. It is to be regretted, however, that the Canadian act fixes no penalty for violation of this clause.

The Canadian federal act in certain circumstances enables the court to reach far beyond its own jurisdiction. Judges may issue a warrant for an adult or child offender who has gone beyond the court's boundaries. The juvenile court judge or the justice of the peace within whose boundaries the offender is, then authorizes execution of

the warrant. Also, if the court has placed delinquents, still under court surveillance, beyond its own jurisdiction, the judge may vary the orders regarding these delinquents as though the delinquents were present in court. Thus the scope of the juvenile court in dealing with its own cases is national, extending across the Dominion. This advantage will be appreciated by American juvenile court authorities who find themselves hampered by state boundaries.

In the United States it is sometimes complained that juvenile court law does not provide for bail.¹ There can be no such complaint against the Canadian law which not only provides for bail but empowers the judge to accept the promise of parents or other responsible persons to produce the child when required. Breach of this promise may be deemed contempt of court.

Informality in the juvenile court is encouraged by the act, so long as consistent with justice. While in Canadian procedure some formalities are required which are omitted in American courts, the act specifically states that if the disposition is in the best interest of the child no adjudication or action shall be quashed because of informality or irregularity. This does not apply in the case of adults, and their sentences may be upset on a technicality.

The federal act has no provision for a plea of guilty by a child, an admirable feature since making such a decision could properly be considered as beyond a child's understanding. The juvenile court is therefore required to take evidence even though the offense be admitted, and this requirement has been sustained by a British

1. Editor's note: No juvenile court in the United States which has good standards makes use of bail. Such practice follows criminal procedure and is contrary to the principles on which the juvenile court is founded. Release to parents or detention in a public or private home makes bail unnecessary.

Columbia supreme court decision. In my own court we follow the ordinary rules of evidence.¹

All trials in Canadian juvenile courts are summary, in the case of both children and adults. This makes for the protection of the child. Recently such procedure has been attacked in the case of an adult on the ground that he lost thereby his right to trial by jury. Here I believe the child should be considered first, both as a child and as the injured party. The adult's lost right of jury trial is not comparable to the child's lost right to the protective environment of the juvenile court. Also under the act the adult has still the right of appeal.

The federal act stresses the desirability of probation and offers it as one method of disposition. Children under twelve years of age may not be committed to industrial schools or reformatories until an attempt has been made to reform them in their own homes, in foster homes or in charge of the Children's Aid, unless the court believes it to be in the best interest of the child and the community. Both Canadian and American laws concerning juvenile delinquency emphasize the importance of supervised probation. Unfortunately in Canada no law requires juvenile courts to resume probation after release from reformatories, though help and advice are seldom more needed than at this critical time.²

The federal act authorizes but does not make compulsory the appointment of probation officers. Frequently juvenile courts tend to reduce probation to a minimum by making use of Children's Aid officials or policemen as probation officers. This practice is undesirable. Just as

1. Editor's note: In juvenile courts in the United States rules of evidence are not followed, as the hearing is *not a trial*. Informal procedure permits hearsay evidence if it has value, and a clinical approach to the child's offense and situation.

2. Editor's note: Return of the child to the probation service of the juvenile court occurs only by informal agreement in the United States, although a new offense may bring the case back into the court with resulting probation supervision. *Parole* from juvenile institutions is most frequently a function of the institution, carried on by staff workers.

communities have their quota of police for regulating adults, so they should have trained protectors for child offenders. Probation work calls for special training and skill, and demands attention and consideration that not all officials possess or are willing to give.

Some authorities urge that detention in detention homes should be limited to days and hours. I believe, however, that a longer detention is beneficial in some cases to provide opportunity for observation and study of the child and to make full use of health and child guidance clinics. At the same time a school should be maintained so that the child's education will not suffer.

The purpose of industrial schools is to afford special training for delinquents. Committals therefore should be for indefinite terms as short sentences defeat the object of the school.

In conclusion, I believe we shall agree that in the best interest of the child offender juvenile court legislation in both our countries must change and advance with a changing social world.

X THE NATIONAL PROBATION ASSOCIATION



Review of the Year 1937-1938

CHARLES L. CHUTE

Executive Director, National Probation Association

THIS report summarizes the activities of the National Probation Association for our fiscal year ending March 31, 1938, the thirty-first year of the existence of the Association and the seventeenth year since its incorporation as an active national agency with a paid staff.

During the year the professional staff of the Association consisted of nine workers: the executive director, the associate director in charge of financial work, the assistant director, two field workers (one on leave), the membership representative, the publicity director and legal assistant, the librarian, and the office manager. Fourteen regular office and clerical workers were employed. We also employed, part time, a student in training from the City College of New York and four girls from the National Youth Administration, working in shifts. The work of the staff has been supervised by an active Board of Trustees and assisted by the Professional Council made up of leaders in probation service from all over the country, by special committees, and by the national membership.

Field Service

The year has been an extremely busy one. More requests for surveys, campaigns, institutes, addresses, and

visits to aid in developing probation services were received than ever before. Below is a summary of the principal field projects undertaken during the year:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA We worked with a committee of the League of Women Voters and other agencies to advance a bill for a new juvenile court law for the District. Members of the staff appeared at hearings before the House and Senate committees. The bill had passed the House but was pending in the Senate at the close of the fiscal year.¹

FLORIDA *Tampa* A representative of the Association visited this city to confer with the newly elected juvenile court judge and probation staff. She addressed several meetings.

ILLINOIS *Springfield* A four week survey of delinquency was made in this city. It was financed in part by a service club. A committee was organized and educational work done. The judge of the juvenile court visited New York to confer with us on the findings. Copies of the report were mimeographed and are available for distribution.

MAINE A representative of the Association attended a meeting of the probation officers of the state. The needs of the service were discussed and steps were taken to form a state organization of the officers.

MICHIGAN Visits were made to Detroit to confer with members of the Governor's committee on legislation to improve the correctional and social work of the state. In July advanced laws were enacted to establish a new state department of corrections with a division of probation empowered to appoint adult probation officers and to supervise the system throughout the state. We have co-

1. Passed, June, 1938.

operated with the state director of probation in developing this service.

MISSOURI As a result of earlier studies and campaigns a law creating a new State Board of Probation and Parole and a staff of state officers was enacted. We have cooperated closely with the new director. The Association prepared the questions for a competitive examination for the state staff. The written papers were rated in our office and the executive director conducted the oral examination. Twelve officers of training and experience were appointed, all from the eligible list. We assisted in a training course for the officers and helped to organize a state probation association.

NEW HAMPSHIRE Two laws, one a new juvenile court act and the other creating a State Board of Probation, were enacted in July 1937. We have cooperated closely with the new board and the director of probation. The Association assisted in setting up the written examination questions, rated the papers, and the executive director conducted the oral examinations in Concord. Four experienced officers were appointed from the head of the eligible list.

NEW YORK Assistance was given to a committee of the New York State Association of Children's Court Judges in preparing a brief on a proposed amendment to the state constitution to strengthen the children's courts of the state. This was distributed and the executive director appeared before the Judiciary Committee of the Constitutional Convention in its support.

NORTH CAROLINA We have cooperated with the state director of probation and staff by visits and a great deal of correspondence.

OHIO *Toledo* At the request of the State Civil Service Commission we assisted in organizing and carrying on a successful examination for a new probation staff for the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court. The written papers for this examination were rated in our office and the executive director spent three days in the city conducting the oral examination. We have kept in close touch with the development of this advanced service.

OKLAHOMA *Tulsa* A representative of the Association made a five day consultation visit, following up our previous survey there, at the invitation of the League of Women Voters and the Tulsa County Conference of Social Workers. Several addresses were made.

OREGON *Portland* A visit to confer with the judge of the juvenile court and his staff was made.

RHODE ISLAND At the request of a committee appointed by the Governor, we assisted in drafting and supporting a completely new juvenile court bill for the state. This, however, failed of passage.

TENNESSEE We have cooperated with the new State Division of Probation and Parole created during the year. A representative of the Association spent several days in Nashville, assisting the new state director and his eight field officers.

TEXAS We assisted in drafting new adult probation and parole bills and urging their passage. A representative of the Association visited a number of cities in the state to do educational work. The bills, however, failed of passage.

VERMONT We have cooperated with the State Department of Public Welfare in reorganizing the state controlled probation and parole system. An increased appropriation was secured and seven full time officers were added to the staff.

OTHER FIELD VISITS Many other visits were made to courts by members of the staff for consultation and assistance. Among the cities so visited were: Little Rock, Arkansas; Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, Oakland, and Sacramento, California; Denver, Colorado; St. Joseph, Missouri; Binghamton, New York; Cincinnati, Ohio; Salt Lake City, Utah; and Seattle, Washington. 185 visits were made to cities in 29 states, the District of Columbia, and Canada to arrange membership appeals and promote interest in the work.

The Western Branch

At the request of judges and probation workers on the Pacific coast, the executive director visited the coast during the summer of 1937 to consider the request which had been received for the establishment of a western branch of the Association. As a result of these conferences it was decided to establish this office. Ralph G. Wales who had had long experience in probation and related work was appointed as the western director and began work with the Association on February 1. After spending a month at headquarters, he started west, visiting many cities en route and consulting with court people. He spoke at a number of conferences in the west and thereafter established the western office of the Association in San Francisco. He will respond to requests for surveys, legislative and consultative work in eleven western states. Very encouraging cooperation has been received from court people and other groups in support of this new departure.

The Prison Industries Reorganization Administration Surveys

A series of valuable surveys and reports on state correctional systems have been made throughout the country by this administration. In all of these studies the system

or lack of system in the administration of probation and parole has been examined. The Association has cooperated closely with the administration. Its field director, Francis H. Hiller, was lent to make these studies for the administration, working on a part time basis until October 1, 1937, and since that date on full time, on leave of absence from the Association. The Association has cooperated in the making of these studies and in many of the states is following them up to get results. New laws and new administrative machinery have resulted from these efforts.

The Coordinating Council Project

Kenneth S. Beam, former director of coordinating councils in Los Angeles, was employed for the first three months of the fiscal year, completing his study of coordinating and neighborhood councils with especial reference to their work in the prevention of delinquency. Mr. Beam has visited many cities to study the various types of councils and has assisted in organizing and improving them. During the year he visited a total of fifty cities in seventeen states and the District of Columbia. He presented a report on his work at our national conference in Indianapolis in May of 1937 and assisted in conducting a special conference on community coordination, after which he returned to California to resume his work in that state. Mr. Beam was employed again for three months in the fall and winter of 1937-38 to come east and follow up the work he had started by visits to many cities. A final report of his work and findings was presented at our 1938 annual conference. As a result of these efforts, nationwide interest has been aroused in bringing together social agencies and citizen groups for organized community efforts to combat the causes of delinquency. This work has been beneficial to the courts and probation services. We have issued a number of reports and leaflets on the

subject which have been in great demand. A national committee to carry forward this work, of which the executive director of the Association is a member, has been formed. An organization has also been formed in California to study and develop councils in California and other states.

Conferences, Institutes and Addresses

NATIONAL CONFERENCE The thirty-first annual conference of the Association was held in Indianapolis in May, just preceding the meetings of the National Conference of Social Work. Thirty states, the District of Columbia, and Canada were represented by 311 delegates. There were thirteen sessions. The Second Annual Conference on Coordinating Councils was included, and during the week which followed several joint sessions were held with the National Conference of Social Work. At the conference we cooperated in the formation of a national association of juvenile court judges.

EASTERN PROBATION CONFERENCE A four day regional probation conference of the Association was held in Philadelphia in cooperation with the American Prison Congress. More than one hundred interested persons attended the four sessions and took advantage of the consultation headquarters established.

CENTRAL STATES CONFERENCE Mr. Hiller represented the Association as speaker at the Central States Probation and Parole Conference at Detroit.

NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL CONFERENCE The Association actively cooperated in formulating the program and in making arrangements for the Second Annual New England Conference on Probation, Parole and Crime Prevention held in Providence in September. The executive director addressed one session.

WESTERN PROBATION AND PAROLE CONFERENCE We cooperated in the arrangements for the second annual meeting of this conference which draws representatives of probation and parole work from nine western states. The executive director participated in the sessions, which were held in Oakland, California. Arrangements were made for the next annual meeting to be held in cooperation with the national conference of the Association in Seattle, in 1938.

BLUE RIDGE INSTITUTE The assistant director, Mrs. Bell, participated in the eleventh annual institute for southern social work executives in Blue Ridge, North Carolina, attended by seventy-nine delegates. The treatment and prevention of delinquency was a major theme.

CALIFORNIA The executive director participated as a speaker in the delinquency session of the ninth annual Institute of Government at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA At the request of the Association and other organizations, the director of the Civilian Conservation Corps camps called together a representative group of persons at a one day conference to discuss the revision of the rules governing the admission of boys to the CCC camps. The executive director participated in the discussion.

GEORGIA Frank Hagerty, field representative, spoke at the Georgia Conference of Social Work held in Savannah.

MICHIGAN The executive director spoke at the annual convention of the Michigan Association of Probate Judges in Grand Rapids.

NEW JERSEY At the invitation of the New Jersey Juvenile Delinquency Commission, the executive director

attended an all day meeting in Trenton. This was attended by New Jersey chief probation officers to make suggestions relative to probation needs in the state.

NEW YORK We cooperated in arrangements for a two day conference on problems in community organization held under the auspices of New York University. The executive director participated in the program.

We participated in the regional conference on social hygiene in New York City.

The executive director spoke at a hearing in New York City called by a joint legislative committee on juvenile delinquency advocating increasing the jurisdictional age of the children's courts of the state. A memorandum was prepared and submitted to the committee.

The assistant director visited Huntington, Long Island, addressing a luncheon meeting of the Council of Social Agencies.

PENNSYLVANIA At the request of the Counsel for the Ruth Legislative Commission, the executive director spent a day in Philadelphia appearing before the Commission to present suggestions regarding probation and parole.

Pittsburgh Upon invitation of the juvenile court judge, the executive director participated in the dedication services of the new Allegheny County Juvenile Court Building.

SOUTH CAROLINA At the invitation of the program committee, the assistant director participated in the South Carolina Conference of Social Work in Columbia as speaker and discussion leader.

TEXAS Mr. Hagerty addressed the Texas State Conference of Social Welfare and the State Probation Officers' Association at Abilene.

VIRGINIA Lynchburg Mrs. Bell was the speaker at a meeting of the Council of Social Agencies and the Women's Club.

WASHINGTON Mrs. Bell spoke at the Washington State Conference of Social Work and conducted a three day institute for probation officers and institutional workers.

WEST VIRGINIA The executive director was a speaker at the Tri-State Regional Welfare Conference at Huntington.

ADDRESSES During the year members of the staff as follows delivered 99 addresses before a great many organizations throughout the country:

Mr. Chute	12
Mr. Hiller	7
Mrs. Bell	15
Mr. Hagerty	20
Mr. Beam	45
	—
Total	99

Several radio addresses were made.

Publications

The following publications were issued during the year: Five issues of the bimonthly magazine, *Probation*.

Coping With Crime, the Yearbook for 1937, 436 pages, containing the proceedings of the annual conference of the Association, other papers and reprints.

Community Cooperation for Social Welfare, 76 pages, a reprint from the 1937 Yearbook, containing the proceedings of the Second Annual Conference on Coordinating Councils.

Pamphlet reprints from the 1937 Yearbook

Legal Handicaps in Juvenile Case Work—Irene Kawin

The Paroled Offender—Parole As It Should Be—Winthrop
D. Lane and Frederick A. Moran

Exclusive Jurisdiction in the Juvenile Court—Judge Joseph
Sieglar

Early Treatment for Problem Children—Dr. C. P. Oberndorf
Case Work Functions and Judicial Functions—Thomas D.
Eliot

The National Probation Association, Organization and Reports,
1937

The Psychologist as a Factor in Court Treatment—Dr. Phyllis
Bartelme

The 1937 Directory of Probation Officers in the United States and Canada, containing the names of almost 5000 probation officers. Approximately 1000 copies were sold.

Selected Reading List, for probation officers and others interested in delinquency.

Children Under Lock and Key, 20 pages, a booklet by Marjorie Bell based chiefly on material gathered by the National Probation Association in a two year study of juvenile detention in the United States.

Community Treatment of Juvenile Delinquents in Ingham County, Michigan, report of a survey by Frank W. Hagerty.

Community Treatment of Delinquency in Sangamon County, Illinois, report of a survey by Frank W. Hagerty.

What Price One Bad Boy? reprint of an article written by the executive director for the June 1937 issue of the American Legion Monthly.

A preliminary announcement regarding the national conference held in Indianapolis and the program.

Announcements promoting the sales of the Yearbook and pamphlets and membership.

Program for the Eastern Probation Conference held in cooperation with the American Prison Congress in Philadelphia.

Several appeal leaflets.

Publicity and Legal Research

On October 1 a full time assistant in the person of Gilbert Cosulich of San Francisco was employed to give approximately half his time to publicity work and half to legal research. He replaced a former part time publicity worker. An encouraging increase in constructive publicity in newspapers and other publications has resulted. Several articles have been written for magazines and bulletins.

A moving picture film exhibited throughout the country, a "March of Time" feature dealing with the treatment and prevention of delinquency and the work of the Association, continued to have wide distribution and use during the year.

Professional Council

At the annual conference of the Association in May 1937 an amendment to the By-laws was adopted establishing the Professional Council of the Association as a permanent body. It was provided that the members be appointed by the president for three year terms. The annual meeting of the Council was held in Indianapolis in May. William J. Harper, director of probation of Westchester County, New York, was reelected chairman, and L. F. Murphy, state director of probation and parole for Wisconsin, vice chairman.

The winter meeting of the Council as reorganized was held at our headquarters in December. Members were present from five states. Plans for the next annual conference of the Association were formulated and many

problems relating to the professional work of the Association were discussed. Mr. Harper attended a subsequent meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Association and made a report to them.

Special Committees

A committee to consider the work of the Association in the field of parole has been appointed consisting of the following persons: Dr. Sheldon Glueck, A. C. Lindholm, Joseph P. Murphy, Judge George W. Smyth, Judge Joseph N. Ulman, Mrs. Willard Parker, L. F. Murphy, the president, and the executive director, ex officio.

At the request of the Interstate Commission on Crime, endorsed at a meeting of our Association in Philadelphia, the Board of Trustees authorized the president to appoint a committee of chief probation officers to cooperate with a similar committee of the American Parole Association in formulating rules for the interstate cooperation of probation officers under the compacts which have been adopted in many states. Joseph P. Murphy of Newark, New Jersey, was appointed chairman early in 1938.

General Work

Among the general projects completed during the year was a compilation of the salaries of probation officers throughout the United States in cities of 20,000 or counties containing such cities. The results of the study have been published in mimeographed form and have been requested by many courts.

A major project of the Association during the year has been assistance given to a number of state civil service commissions, to state probation boards, to committees and local judges in preparing and conducting examinations for probation officers. In addition to the examinations which we arranged and conducted in a

number of states, we have assisted in others by supplying information, preparing questions or rating examination papers.

Much time was spent by members of the staff in compiling the material for the national directory of probation officers. It required a vast amount of correspondence to secure these data for the compilation of this 156 page book. This is the most complete and accurate directory of probation officers ever prepared.

During the year the Association has conducted an information service for the entire country. Daily requests for information and literature are answered. Literature has been sent out for free distribution at conferences, and exhibits have been supplied.

The Association keeps a registry of qualified probation officers who want new positions or who desire to enter the work. While a regular employment bureau cannot be maintained, recommendations of desirable candidates are sent to judges and appointing officers on request. Occasionally probation officers have been placed in that way.

Board and Staff Changes

Additions to the Board of Trustees made during the year were Monsignor Robert F. Keegan, Secretary for Catholic Charities in New York; A. Newbold Morris of New York; and Arthur C. Lindholm, chairman, State Board of Parole, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Ralph G. Wales, formerly executive secretary of the Protective Service Bureau in Buffalo and for eight years probation officer in the Court of General Sessions, New York City, was appointed to the position of director of the western branch office.

Gilbert Cosulich was employed to work on publicity and legal research. His experience includes a good deal of writing in the crime prevention and probation fields,

editorial work on several newspapers and pioneer work as federal probation officer in Arizona. He was until recently a law clerk in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco and taught criminal law in the Lincoln University Law School at San Francisco.

Frank W. Hagerty, employed as field representative on a year's leave of absence from his position as probation officer in the United States District Court in New York City, finished his work with the Association at the end of March.

Membership and Financial Support

The total paid-up membership of the Association on March 31, 1937 was 15,466, an increase of 2,424 over 1936. On March 31, 1938 the total membership was 16,463, an increase of 997 over 1937. The classified membership contributions for the year are shown in the following table:

Membership Contributions Received

April 1, 1937 - March 31, 1938

Amount Contributed	Number of Contributors	
	New	Renewals
Up to \$1.99.....	259	1279
\$2.00 only	1232	2968
\$2.01 to \$5.00.....	1673	4955
\$5.01 to \$10.00.....	717	2253
\$10.01 to \$25.00.....	224	703
\$25.01 to \$50.00.....	20	118
\$50.01 to \$100.00.....	19	37
Over \$100.00.....	3	3
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	4147	12,316
Total	16,463	

The total receipts and disbursements of the Association for the fiscal year are shown in the treasurer's report herewith. Our members and individual contributors have continued to stand by us loyally during the difficult year. Some have increased their contributions. The Association has been greatly aided by leading supporters in many cities who have cooperated in sponsoring financial appeals for the work. The increased number of these appeals largely explains the new members and supporters.

As will be seen above the great bulk of the support of the Association comes from small contributions from many interested persons. The Association has members in every state of the Union. Acknowledgment should be made here of a generous contribution of \$1000 from Henry Ford, who has expressed much interest in our work. This is the only contribution of that size received during the year.

Due to the generosity of our many contributors, the Association was able to close the year free from debt and with a working balance on hand in its general fund. We have no endowment but a permanent reserve fund has been developed for use in case of emergency. This fund is invested in bonds and deposited in savings banks and brings in a small regular interest return. During the year the Board of Trustees voted to allocate this reserve fund to maintain an item covering all legacies received by the Association and special gifts, and to set apart other funds, approximating the amounts contributed, as memorials to deceased friends of the Association. This division of funds is shown in the treasurer's report herewith.

Interest in the work of the Association to develop individual study and effective treatment of those coming before the courts is constantly increasing. As it is the only national organization in this field the demands and oppor-

tunities for service are unlimited. In return for the confidence of our generous contributors, we have endeavored to carry on the work as economically and as effectively as possible. We bespeak the interest and assistance of all who read this report.



Treasurer's Report

The following is a copy of the statement submitted by our auditors:

STATEMENT OF RECORDED CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS OF THE GENERAL FUND FOR THE YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 1938

BALANCE, APRIL 1, 1937.....\$ 11,071.45

RECEIPTS:

Dues and contributions.....	\$105,797.47
Local contributions for field service expenses	2,432.00
Sale of publications.....	2,496.11
Interest on bonds.....	900.00
Interest on bank balances.....	615.06
Miscellaneous	288.57
Total receipts	112,529.21
Total.....	\$123,600.66

DISBURSEMENTS:

Salaries	\$ 55,713.35
Extra service	4,358.11
Travel expenses	9,411.28
Printing	9,852.31
Multigraphing	6,930.94
Postage and express.....	9,308.34
Rent	5,446.80
Office supplies	1,984.95
Telephone and telegraph.....	1,179.05
Equipment	408.94
Transfer of cash to reserve fund....	5,000.00
Purchase of publications.....	409.22
Miscellaneous	709.31
Total disbursements	110,712.60

BALANCE, MARCH 31, 1938:

On deposit (including \$5,928.86 in savings accounts)	\$ 11,763.06	
Petty cash fund	25.00	
Travel expense funds.....	1,100.00	<u>\$12,888.06</u>

ACCOUNTANTS' CERTIFICATE

National Probation Association, Inc.:

We have made an examination of the recorded cash receipts and disbursements of your general fund in relation to the accompanying statement thereof for the year ended March 31, 1938, and have inspected the securities of the reserve fund as shown by the records and verified the cash balances of the general and reserve funds as of March 31, 1938.

In our opinion, the accompanying statements set forth the recorded cash receipts and disbursements of the general fund for the year ended March 31, 1938, and the cash balance of that fund and the investments and cash balance of the reserve fund as of that date.

(Signed) HASKINS & SELLS.

New York, April 26, 1938

STATEMENT OF RESERVE FUND INVESTMENTS
AND CASH, MARCH 31, 1938

	Face Amount	Cost
SECURITIES (Bonds purchased — approximate market quotation value, \$31,171.25)	\$40,000.00	\$36,833.50
Cash on deposit with savings banks.....		<u>28,077.90</u>
TOTAL RESERVE FUND.....		<u><u>\$64,911.40</u></u>

TREASURER'S NOTES:

1. There were unpaid bills carried over on March 31, 1938 amounting to \$1,879.47, since paid.
2. During the year \$5,000.00 was transferred from the general fund to the reserve fund.
3. By action of the Board of Trustees, it was decided that the sources of the reserve fund should be set forth in this report. The legacies received since the incorporation of the Association, gifts from deceased persons which have been set apart as memorials, and certain special gifts from persons living have been included in the reserve fund. Additional sums have been transferred to the reserve fund from time to time. These are held in a contingent reserve.

None of the legacies and other funds received by the Association have been restricted in any way as to their use for the work of the organization. We are deeply indebted to the persons whose names appear on the statement which follows, for their generous interest and assistance.

RESERVE FUND, MARCH 31, 1938

LEGACIES

1926	Mrs. Annie R. Miller, Newark, New Jersey	\$ 1,870.22
1927	Miss Sarah Newlin, Philadelphia	500.00
1929	Mrs. S. Edith Van Buskirk, Wyckoff, New Jersey	100.00
1931	Mrs. Winifred Tyson, New York	1,000.00
1933	John Markle, New York	10,000.00
		<hr/> \$13,470.22

MEMORIALS

1924	Miss Wilhelmine F. Coolbaugh, Chicago	\$ 1,000.00
1925	Joseph Boyer, Detroit	500.00
1930	V. Everit Macy, Westchester County, New York	1,850.00
1932	George Eastman, Rochester, New York	1,500.00
1934	Mrs. Helen Hartley Jenkins and the Hartley Corporation, New York	11,150.00
1936	Tracy W. McGregor, Detroit	2,150.00
1937	Mrs. Fannie B. Look, Los Angeles	5,000.00
		<hr/> \$23,150.00

SPECIAL GIFTS

1925	Mrs. Leonard Elmhirst, New York	\$ 1,200.00
1927	Mrs. Lilly A. Fleischmann, Cin- cinnati, Ohio	500.00
1936	Miss Mabel I. Hilliard, Donnell- son, Ohio	325.00
		<hr/> \$ 2,025.00

\$ 38,645.22

CONTINGENT RESERVE 26,266.18

TOTAL..... \$64,911.40

HENRY DEFOREST BALDWIN

Treasurer



Minutes of the Annual Meeting

ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, JUNE 25, 1938

THE business meeting was held in connection with the thirty-second annual conference of the Association. Judge George W. Smyth, vice president of the Association, presided. About fifty members of the Association were present.

Judge Smyth presented an informal report for the Board of Trustees. The executive director presented a report on the work of the Association for the past year.

Joseph P. Murphy, chairman of the committee on interstate compacts, presented a report for the committee. A set of proposed rules for the interstate transfer of probationers was read. VOTED: That the committee on interstate compacts be continued and that it be requested to report its recommendations to the meeting of the Interstate Crime Commission at Cleveland in July.

The executive director presented a brief report of progress on behalf of the committee appointed by the Board of Trustees to consider the relationships between probation and parole.

L. F. Murphy, newly elected chairman of the Professional Council, presented a report on the work of the Council for the past year prepared by William J. Harper, retiring chairman. Mr. Murphy reported on the actions taken at a meeting of the Council earlier in the day. The report was received and adopted.

L. Wallace Hoffman, chairman of the committee on

resolutions, presented a series of resolutions which were separately considered and adopted:

1. WHEREAS, there have been numerous requests during recent years for the publication of a course of instruction and manual of probation procedure and technique; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Board of Trustees be urged to appoint a special committee whose duty it shall be to organize and compile such a course of instruction or manual as it may see fit and to make such publication available to members of the National Probation Association and such other persons as may be interested.

2. WHEREAS, an adequate system of probation and parole is needed in each state, and

WHEREAS, some states are unable to properly finance such programs; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the National Probation Association endorse the enactment of federal legislation extending financial aid to states in need thereof for the purpose of establishing programs of probation and parole meeting generally accepted standards.

3. RESOLVED: That we urge the Board of Trustees of the National Probation Association to promote increased cooperation and closer affiliation between the various regional probation and parole associations and the National Probation Association, in order that the facilities of the national association may become more effective in developing those types of service most needed within the various regions.

4. RESOLVED: That the National Probation Association endorse in principle the theory of interstate compacts for reciprocity in the supervision of probationers and parolees and that in those states where compacts may be entered into we urge the adoption of rules and regulations approved by the Association and the Interstate Commission on Crime for the purpose of implementing the compacts.

5. WHEREAS, we recognize the value of a "house organ" in developing the morale of an organization; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That we recommend the publication of an informal, more or less personal monthly news letter, to be distributed to the probation officers of the country.

6. RESOLVED: That the National Probation Association extend a vote of thanks to the social agencies of Seattle, to the local committee on arrangements, to John C. Kelly, Jr., chairman of the committee, to the Olympic Hotel, and to all individuals and groups who participated in making this conference successful; that special thanks be extended to the press of Seattle for the unusually fine publicity afforded the work of the conference; that the conference express its sincere appreciation of the tireless efforts of the executive director, Charles L. Chute, his able assistant, Mrs. Marjorie Bell, his regional assistant, Ralph G. Wales, and all other officers and staff members for their splendid efforts in making this conference a success, and their fine contributions toward the achievement of the aims of the National Probation Association during the past year.

L. WALLACE HOFFMAN, Toledo, Ohio, *Chairman*
A. C. LINDHOLM, St. Paul, Minnesota
HOWARD L. GEE, Salt Lake City, Utah
VICTOR C. PASSAGE, Bridgeport, Connecticut

Judge Joseph N. Uрман, chairman of the committee on nominations, presented the following report:

The committee is charged with the duty of presenting for your consideration nominations to fill the places of ten members of the Board of Trustees of the Association whose terms expire at this time.

The committee recommends for reelection for the full three year terms nine of the ten members whose terms have expired, namely: Henry deForest Baldwin, New York; Mrs. Sidney C. Borg, New York; Mrs. Frank H. Dodge, Little Rock, Arkansas; Mrs. Dora Shaw Heffner, Los Angeles; Charles Evans Hughes, Jr., New York; Joseph P. Murphy, Newark; Laurence G. Payson, New York; Judge John Forbes Perkins, Boston; Percival Wilds, New York.

For the remaining vacancy in place of A. Newbold Morris, New York, we nominate Daniel E. Koshland, San Francisco, vice president of Levi Strauss and Company, member of the probation committee of the juvenile court, and an active member and sponsor of the National Probation Association.

Respectfully submitted

JOSEPH N. ULMAN, Baltimore, *Chairman*
JOHN J. DOYLE, St. Paul
RICHARD C. CHAPPELL, Washington, D.C.

VOTED: That the nominations presented by the committee be approved and that the secretary be instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for the election to the Board of Trustees for three year terms of the ten names presented. The meeting adjourned.

CHARLES L. CHUTE, *Executive Director*



Officers, Board of Trustees, Advisory
Committee, Professional Council,
Staff

NATIONAL PROBATION ASSOCIATION

Organized 1907, Incorporated 1921

50 WEST FIFTIETH STREET, NEW YORK

Western Office 110 SUTTER STREET, SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICERS AND BOARD 1938-1939

President and Chairman, Board of Trustees

TIMOTHY N. PFEIFFER New York City

Vice President

GEORGE W. SMYTH White Plains, New York
Judge, Westchester County Children's Court

Treasurer

HENRY DEFOREST BALDWIN New York City

Honorary Vice Presidents

JULIAN W. MACK New York City
Judge, Circuit Court of Appeals

PAUL V. McNUTT Manila, Philippine Islands
American High Commissioner

HERBERT C. PARSONS Boston, Massachusetts
Massachusetts Child Council

EDWARD F. WAITE Minneapolis, Minnesota
Judge, Juvenile Court

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Terms Expire 1941

- †*HENRY DEFOREST BALDWIN New York City
 MRS. SIDNEY C. BORG New York City
Vice President, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies
 MRS. FRANK DODGE Little Rock, Arkansas
Chairman, Advisory Committee, State Juvenile Court Department
 MRS. DORA SHAW HEFFNER . . . Los Angeles, California
Commissioner, Juvenile Court
 CHARLES EVANS HUGHES, JR. New York City
 DANIEL E. KOSHLAND San Francisco, California
 *JOSEPH P. MURPHY Newark, New Jersey
Chief, Essex County Probation Department
 †LAURENCE G. PAYSON New York City
 JOHN FORBES PERKINS Boston, Massachusetts
Judge, Juvenile Court
 †*PERCIVAL WILDS Riverdale, New York

Terms Expire 1940

- HERBERT G. COCHRAN Norfolk, Virginia
Judge, Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court
 HARRY L. EASTMAN Cleveland, Ohio
Judge, Juvenile Court
 *IRVING W. HALPERN New York City
Chief Probation Officer, Court of General Sessions
 CHARLES W. HOFFMAN Cincinnati, Ohio
Judge, Court of Domestic Relations
 †SAM A. LEWISOHN New York City
 ARTHUR C. LINDHOLM St. Paul, Minnesota
Chairman, State Board of Parole
 NEWBOLD NOYES Washington, D. C.
The Evening Star

- * Member of executive committee
 † Member of finance committee

- JOSEPH SIEGLER Newark, New Jersey
Judge, Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court
- ALFRED E. SMITH New York City
Former Governor of New York State
- †FRANK C. VAN CLEEF New York City

Terms Expire 1939

- CHARLES L. CHUTE New York City
- JOHN H. FINLEY New York City
Editor, New York Times
- †*EDWIN L. GARVIN New York City
- SHELDON GLUECK Cambridge, Massachusetts
Professor of Criminology, Harvard Law School
- MONSIGNOR ROBERT F. KEEGAN New York City
- JOEL R. MOORE Jackson, Michigan
Warden, State Prison of Southern Michigan
- MRS. WILLARD PARKER New York City
- †*TIMOTHY N. PFEIFFER New York City
- *GEORGE W. SMYTH White Plains, New York
Judge, Westchester County Children's Court
- JOSEPH N. ULMAN Baltimore, Maryland
Judge, Supreme Bench

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- FLORENCE E. ALLEN Cleveland, Ohio
Judge, U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals
- SANFORD BATES New York City
Executive Director, Boys' Clubs of America
- CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM New York City
- ABRAHAM FLEXNER Princeton, New Jersey
Institute for Advanced Study
- BERNARD FLEXNER New York City
- MRS. HARRY HART Chicago, Illinois

* Member of executive committee

† Member of finance committee

376 OFFICERS, TRUSTEES, ADVISORY, COUNCIL, STAFF

STANLEY H. JOHNSON	Denver, Colorado
<i>Judge, District Court</i>	
RALPH JONAS	New York City
DR. HOWARD A. KELLY	Baltimore, Maryland
GEORGE W. KIRCHWEY	New York City
THE RT. REV. WILLIAM LAWRENCE .	Boston, Massachusetts
GEORGE MACDONALD	New York City
WILLIAM M. MALTBIE	Hartford, Connecticut
<i>Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Errors</i>	
JOSEPH E. MEYER	Des Moines, Iowa
<i>Judge, Juvenile Court</i>	
SPENCER MILLER, JR.	New York City
RAYMOND MOLEY	New York City
MRS. W. L. MURDOCH	Birmingham, Alabama
MRS. GIFFORD PINCHOT	Milford, Pennsylvania
ROSCOE POUND	Watertown, Massachusetts
VICTOR F. RIDDER	New York City
THEODORE ROOSEVELT	Oyster Bay, New York
ALBERT A. SPRAGUE	Chicago, Illinois
HENRY W. TAFT	New York City
MRS. LEWIS S. THOMPSON	Red Bank, New Jersey
MIRIAM VAN WATERS	Framingham, Massachusetts
<i>Superintendent, Reformatory for Women</i>	
MARTIN H. VOGEL	New York City
MRS. MARJORIE PEABODY WAITE, Saratoga Springs, New York	
MRS. PERCY T. WALDEN	New Haven, Connecticut
RABBI STEPHEN S. WISE	New York City
<i>Free Synagogue</i>	
B. LORING YOUNG	Boston, Massachusetts
<i>Chairman, Massachusetts Board of Probation</i>	
CARL V. WEYGANDT	Columbus, Ohio
<i>Chief Justice, Supreme Court</i>	
MRS. THOMAS RAEBURN WHITE, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	

PROFESSIONAL COUNCIL

L. F. MURPHY, <i>Chairman</i>	Madison, Wisconsin
CHARLES B. VAUGHAN, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	Raleigh, North Carolina
CHARLES L. CHUTE, <i>Secretary</i>	New York City
MRS. LILLIAN McDERMOTT	Little Rock, Arkansas
KENYON J. SCUDDER	Los Angeles, California
JOHN P. PLOVER	Sacramento, California
JUDGE EUGENE MADDEN, JR.	Denver, Colorado
VICTOR C. PASSAGE	Bridgeport, Connecticut
WILLIAM D. BARNES	Hartford, Connecticut
RICHARD A. CHAPPELL	Washington, D. C.
GENEVIEVE GABOWER	Washington, D. C.
JUDGE WALTER S. CRISWELL	Jacksonville, Florida
LOTTIE RAMSPECK	Atlanta, Georgia
IRENE KAWIN	Chicago, Illinois
WALTER K. URICH	Chicago, Illinois
OLON C. VIAL	Indianapolis, Indiana
CLEATIE H. DEVINE	Des Moines, Iowa
NORMAN BRADEN	Frankfort, Kentucky
PAUL E. SEIDLER	New Orleans, Louisiana
CHARLES R. POMEROY	Auburn, Maine
WILLIAM L. STUCKERT	Baltimore, Maryland
ALBERT B. CARTER	Boston, Massachusetts
RALPH HALL FERRIS	Lansing, Michigan
ARTHUR C. LINDHOLM	St. Paul, Minnesota
JOHN J. DOYLE	St. Paul, Minnesota
ROBERT C. EDSON	Jefferson City, Missouri
MILTON W. WEIFFENBACH	St. Louis, Missouri
RICHARD T. SMITH	Concord, New Hampshire
JOSEPH P. MURPHY	Newark, New Jersey
EDWARD J. TAYLOR	Albany, New York
EDWARD P. VOLZ	Buffalo, New York
CLINTON W. ARESON	New York City
IRVING W. HALPERN	New York City
PATRICK J. SHELLY	New York City
ABRAM N. JONES	Rochester, New York
WILLIAM J. HARPER	White Plains, New York
A. W. CLINE	Winston-Salem, North Carolina
MARY E. McCHRISTIE	Cincinnati, Ohio
EDWARD J. CRAWLEY	Cleveland, Ohio
L. WALLACE HOFFMAN	Toledo, Ohio
JUDGE DONALD E. LONG	Portland, Oregon
LEON T. STERN	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

378 OFFICERS, TRUSTEES, ADVISORY, COUNCIL, STAFF

ROBERT C. TABER	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
WALTER J. ROME	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
JOSEPH H. HAGAN	Providence, Rhode Island
C. C. MENZLER	Nashville, Tennessee
REED COZART	San Antonio, Texas
B. H. ROBINSON	Salt Lake City, Utah
MRS. EDNA G. JOHNSON	Montpelier Vermont
JUDGE JAMES HOGE RICKS	Richmond, Virginia
J. C. KELLY, JR.	Seattle, Washington

S T A F F

CHARLES L. CHUTE	<i>Executive Director</i>
K. KENNETH-SMITH	<i>Associate Director</i>
MARJORIE BELL	<i>Assistant Director</i>
FRANCIS H. HILLER	<i>Field Director</i>
RALPH G. WALES	<i>Director, Western Office</i>
GILBERT COSULICH	<i>Legal Assistant and Publicity Director</i>
R. GARNIER STREIT	<i>Membership Representative</i>
EDITH MCWILLIAMS	<i>Librarian</i>
SALLIE H. UNDERWOOD	<i>Office Manager</i>



Report of the Professional Council

SINCE the last annual meeting at Indianapolis the major activities of your Council have been assisting to plan for speakers and topics for the present conference, and discussing problems which were referred to the Council by the Board of Trustees.

One of these problems concerned the functional relationship of the National Probation Association to state probation associations and other groups, particularly in matters of arrangements for state and regional conferences. It was agreed that the National Probation Association should assist in the promotion of such conferences whenever possible and should plan to participate in those conducted under other auspices. This agreement was reached after receipt of a report of progress from the special committee on state associations of which Edward J. Crawley of Cleveland is chairman. There remains for further discussion the relationship of the National Association to state probation departments.

The Board of Trustees was requested to appoint a committee on interstate compacts for the supervision of persons on probation. Joseph P. Murphy of Newark pointed out the need of drafting separate rules concerning proper probation procedures, since conditions pertinent to probation differ in many respects from those of parole.

At the request of the executive director, the Council suggested plans for participation by the Association in the American Prison Congress last October at Philadelphia, one feature of which was an "experience meeting" in which executives and chairmen of probation departments presented for discussion some of their practices and problems.

The executive director reported that plans were being

completed for the opening of the western branch office of the Association on the Pacific Coast. This conformed to the Council's request to the Board of Trustees.

The Council suggested that the Board of Trustees arrange a conference with representatives of the motion picture industry in an effort to have probation service portrayed in a more adequate and humane manner than it is sometimes presented; also that the Association prepare a film on the work of probation for distribution and use by probation departments; more newspaper and magazine articles and greater use of the radio in the form of both addresses and dramatized skits to offset some of the unfavorable and misleading publicity which has been offered at times by those unacquainted with or unsympathetic to probation.

In addition, the possibilities which exist of presenting local probation activities to the local communities were discussed and accepted as chiefly the responsibility of the respective probation departments.

The Council reaffirmed its belief that the Association should concentrate its major activities upon the advancement of probation service.

The Council still has under discussion the question as to whether the Association should hold its national conference during the general social work conference or partly before and partly during the general conference as is the present practice. One suggestion was to hold a regional conference before the general conference in conjunction with the National Conference of Social Work. This would seem to meet most of the objections to the present method.

Your chairman, representing you, attended the January meeting of the Board of Trustees at its request and presented a report on the work of the Council. This invi-

tation by the Board was in conformity with the request made by the Council last year.

The above represents some of the chief activities of your Council during the past year and is subject to the approval of the members at the National Conference in Seattle at which I regret I cannot be present. It is unnecessary to tell my fellow-workers that I shall miss the personal stimulation and help which I always receive when we gather together.

Your Professional Council is only two years old but I believe it has justified its existence. As I see its future, it will continue to offer its services and suggestions to the Board of Trustees upon request and in an advisory capacity. As I stated last year, much of what we do depends upon the initiative of the Board of Trustees.


I feel that we have been of assistance to the Board, and I know that the Council discussions were of considerable value to those of us who were in attendance.

The executive director and his staff contributed much to these deliberations. Your chairman at times felt that we were having panel discussions or running a forum instead of a meeting, so vigorously were various points of view presented, all in a spirit of understanding cooperation and mutual helpfulness.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM J. HARPER, *Chairman*
Professional Council

June 17, 1938



Minutes

MEETING OF THE PROFESSIONAL COUNCIL

THE Council met at a luncheon meeting in connection with the thirty-second annual conference of the National Probation Association.

L. F. Murphy of Wisconsin, vice chairman of the Council, presided in the absence of William J. Harper, chairman. In addition the following members were present:

John J. Doyle and Arthur C. Lindholm, Minnesota; Robert C. Edson, Missouri; Joseph P. Murphy, New Jersey; A. W. Cline, North Carolina; L. Wallace Hoffman, Ohio; Judge Donald E. Long, Oregon; B. H. Robinson, Utah; John C. Kelly, Jr., Washington; and Charles L. Chute, secretary.

A report on the work of the Council for the past year, prepared by William J. Harper, was read and approved for presentation at the annual business meeting of the Association.

Mr. L. F. Murphy was elected chairman of the Council for the ensuing year; Charles B. Vaughan, assistant director of the North Carolina Adult Probation Department, was elected vice chairman; Charles L. Chute was reelected secretary.

L. Wallace Hoffman presented an informal report for the committee appointed one year ago on the relationship of the Association to state probation organizations. The committee consisted of Edward J. Crawley of Cleveland, chairman, Mary E. McChristie of Cincinnati, and Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman summarized a report presented by the committee at the meeting of the Council in New

York in December. He stated that the committee met with other members of the Professional Council attending the Central States Probation and Parole Conference at Columbus in June. At this meeting the suggestion was advanced that the national association might give more active recognition to state associations, constituting them as state chapters or state units. Mr. Hoffman suggested that some action should be taken to provide for such recognition. He described the need for reorganizing and developing a new state organization in Ohio representative of all probation departments.

Mr. Edson reported on the establishment of a new state probation and parole association in Missouri. Affiliation with the National Probation Association was favored.

Relationship and affiliation of the Association with regional probation and parole conferences was brought into the discussion.

After considerable discussion, it was voted on motion of Mr. Hoffman that the chairman of the Council appoint a new national committee to consider the whole question of the relationship of the national association to state organizations, and also to regional probation and parole conferences.

The question of the dates of our national conference was discussed and a consensus of opinion was that the present plan of holding the same two days in advance of the opening date of the National Conference of Social Work, merging with the latter thereafter, was the most satisfactory plan.

The recommendation was made and approved that the names of newly appointed chief probation officers be published from time to time in the magazine, *PROBATION*. There was also general approval of the plan announced by Mr. Chute of publishing a cumulative supplement of

the national directory of probation officers at regular intervals.


A discussion was held on the publications now issued by the Association and they were generally approved. A further suggestion was made that when possible it would be desirable for the Association to issue a news bulletin or house organ, in addition to the present bimonthly magazine.

Ralph G. Wales, western representative of the Association, was called upon to report on his work. He stated that he had established a western branch office at 110 Sutter Street, San Francisco; that he had already visited nine states in his territory west of the Rockies and had been received cordially everywhere, enthusiasm and co-operation being expressed by all.

Judge Donald E. Long of the juvenile court of Portland spoke approvingly of the plans for Mr. Wales' work and of the contacts that he had made.

The meeting adjourned.

CHARLES L. CHUTE, *Secretary*



By-laws

NATIONAL PROBATION ASSOCIATION, INC.

Adopted May 31, 1919. Amended April 14, 1920; June 21, 1921;
June 22, 1922; June 9, 1929; May 14, 1932; May 22, 1937.

ARTICLE I—NAME

The corporate name of this organization shall be the National Probation Association, Incorporated.

ARTICLE II—OBJECTS

The objects of this Association are:

To study and standardize methods of probation and parole work, both juvenile and adult, by conferences, field investigations and research;

To extend and develop the probation system by legislation, the publication and distribution of literature, and in other ways;

To promote the establishment and development of juvenile courts, domestic relations or family courts and other specialized courts using probation;

To cooperate so far as possible with all movements promoting the scientific and humane treatment of delinquency and its prevention.

ARTICLE III—MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the Association shall consist of persons and organizations who apply for membership and are accepted by the Board of Trustees and who pay dues annually. Members shall be classified as active members, contributing members, supporting members, sustaining members, patrons, life members, and organization members. Active members shall be those who pay dues of \$2.00 or more a year; except that when arrangements are made for the affiliation of all the members of a state or local association of probation officers, paying joint dues in the local and national association, the Board of Trustees may authorize a reduction of dues for active membership. Contributing members shall be those

who contribute \$5.00 or more annually to the Association. Supporting members shall be those who contribute \$10.00 or more annually to the Association. Sustaining members shall be those who contribute \$25.00 or more annually to the Association. Patrons shall be those who contribute \$100 or more during a single calendar year. Life members shall be those who contribute \$1,000.00 or more to the Association. Organization members shall consist of organizations, courts or institutions which shall contribute \$10.00 or more annually to the Association. Members who fail to pay their dues after reasonable notice in writing by the treasurer or executive director shall thereupon cease to be members.

ARTICLE IV—OFFICERS

The officers of the Association shall consist of a president, one or more vice presidents, and a treasurer who shall be elected annually by the Board of Trustees and shall serve until their successors are elected, and an executive director who shall be elected by said board to serve during its pleasure. The board also in its discretion may elect honorary officers who shall serve for such terms as the board shall determine.

ARTICLE V—DUTIES OF OFFICERS

The president, or in his absence a vice president, shall act as chairman at all business meetings of the Association. The treasurer shall have charge of the finances of the Association and shall report thereon to the Board of Trustees. The executive director shall be the chief executive officer of the Association. He shall be paid such compensation as may be determined by the board.

ARTICLE VI—OTHER EMPLOYEES

Other members of the executive staff and clerical assistants shall be appointed in such manner and for such terms and compensation as may be determined from time to time by the Board of Trustees.

ARTICLE VII—BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Board of Trustees shall consist of thirty members to be elected by the members of the Association at its annual meeting. The twenty-one directors now in office, whose terms expire subsequent to the annual meeting in May 1932, shall continue to hold office as trustees until the expiration of the terms for which they were respectively elected. At the annual meeting in May 1932 nine additional trustees shall be elected, three for terms of one year each, three for terms of two years each, and three for terms of three years each. At each annual meeting thereafter ten trustees shall be elected for terms of three years each. The board may fill any vacancy, however created, occurring among the officers or members of the Board of Trustees for the unexpired term. The board shall elect a chairman annually. He shall preside at the meetings of the board and shall be ex officio a member of all committees of the board.

ARTICLE VIII—DUTIES OF TRUSTEES

The Board of Trustees shall elect the officers, shall have general direction of the work of the Association and shall administer the funds of the Association. It shall report to the Association at the annual meeting and at such other times as the Association may require.

ARTICLE IX—COMMITTEES

There shall be an executive committee elected annually by the board, which shall consist of the chairman of the board, who shall be chairman of the executive committee, and six other members. Such committee shall have the powers and perform the duties of the Board of Trustees between the meetings of the board, subject to the confirmation of its action by the board. Three members shall constitute a quorum.

There shall be a finance committee consisting of a chairman and such other members as shall be determined by the Board of Trustees. Its duties shall be those which usually pertain to such

a committee. It shall be appointed in the manner provided for by the board.

There shall be a Professional Council of the Association to consist of representatives of the courts and probation and parole services from the various sections of the country. The council shall consist of thirty or more members who shall be appointed by the president. One third of the members of the council appointed in 1937 shall serve for one year, one third for two years and one third for three years. In advance of each annual meeting the president of the Association shall appoint for three year terms the successors of those members whose terms shall expire at such meeting, and such other members in each class as may be necessary to equalize the number of members in each class. The council shall elect its own officers annually at a meeting held in connection with the annual meeting of the Association. The council shall make recommendations to the Board of Trustees in regard to all matters concerning the professional work of the Association.

A nominating committee consisting of five members of the Association shall be appointed by the president each year to nominate candidates for membership on the Board of Trustees.

Such other standing and special committees as may be authorized by the Association or the Board of Trustees shall be appointed by the president, unless otherwise directed by the Association or by the board.

ARTICLE X—MEETINGS

The annual meeting of the Association shall be held on the third Tuesday in May or on such day and at such place as may be determined by the trustees. Special meetings may be held as determined by the trustees. Ten members shall constitute a quorum. Meetings of the Board of Trustees shall be held at such times and places as the board may determine. One third of the members shall constitute a quorum of the board.

ARTICLE XI—AMENDMENTS

These by-laws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Association present at the annual meeting, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees.



The Program of the National Probation Association

THE Association is the only national agency exclusively engaged in the effort to extend and improve probation service, together with juvenile and other specialized courts for effective dealing with child and family problems. It is concerned with the coordination of probation, parole and institutional work and interested in all measures for the effective social treatment and prevention of crime.

The Association has :

1. a nationwide membership of probation workers, judges and citizens interested in the successful application of the probation principle;
2. an active continuing board of trustees made up of prominent judges, probation workers and representative citizens;
3. an experienced staff which carries on its program.

In its working program the Association :

1. conducts city and statewide surveys of courts and probation departments, prepares reports, organizes and cooperates with local committees and agencies to maintain and develop effective probation and social court organization;
2. drafts laws to extend and improve probation and juvenile courts, and assists in securing the enactment of these laws;
3. aids judges in securing competent probation officers and assists the officers and other qualified persons in obtaining placements;
4. promotes state supervision of probation and cooperates with state departments and associations;
5. conducts a national probation conference and assists with special conferences and institutes for training probation officers;
6. carries on a research program for the study of practical problems in this field;

7. serves as a clearing house for information and literature on probation, juvenile courts, domestic relations courts, and crime prevention, for the entire country;
8. publishes a bimonthly magazine, *Probation*, with information and practical articles; the *Yearbook*, with addresses and reports of the annual conference; a *National Directory of Probation Officers*; summaries of juvenile court and probation legislation; case record forms for probation officers; reports of surveys and studies; practical leaflets and pamphlets.

Membership in the Association is open to everyone. Each member receives the bimonthly magazine, Probation, and the Yearbook upon request.

Membership classes: active, \$2; contributing, \$5; supporting, \$10; sustaining, \$25; patron, \$100 or over.

The Association is supported entirely by membership dues and voluntary contributions. Gifts are urgently needed to meet the growing needs of the work and the many requests for assistance from courts and communities all over the country. Contributions to the Association are deductible from income tax returns.

FORM OF BEQUEST

I devise and bequeath to the National Probation Association, Inc., incorporated under Article Three of the Membership Corporation Law of the State of New York, to be applied to the benevolent uses and purposes of said Association, and under its direction [here insert description of the money or property given]



INDEX

A

- Adult probation (*see Probation*)
Advisory Committee on Education, 17
Aichhorn, August, 247
Alabama, 18
Alcatraz, 12
American Association of Schools of Professional Social Work, 71
American Association of Social Workers, 71, 74
American Law Institute, 41
American Parole Association, 336, 361
American Prison Association, 335
Congress, 355, 379
American Public Welfare Association, 79
American Youth Commission, 258, 299
Arkansas, 16, 17, 18, 353
Astredo, J. C., 45
Attorney General of U. S. (*see U. S. Attorney General*)

B

- Baldwin, Henry deForest, 368, 371
Bates, Sanford (*paper*), 1
quoted, 261
Beam, Kenneth S., 354, 358
paper, 308
Bell, Marjorie, 356, 358, 359, 371, 378
Bennett, James V., 8
quoted, 207
Big Brothers, 48
Big Sisters, 48
Blue Ridge Institute, 356
Boarding homes, 211 ff, 225 ff

- Boy Scouts, 100, 198, 230, 299
Boys' Clubs of America, 1, 25
Boys' Court, 180 ff
Braucher, Howard (*quoted*), 257
Braude, Jacob M. (*paper*), 180
Bromberg, Walter, 249
Bronner, Augusta F., 247
Brooklyn Adolescent Court, 180
Brown, Fred, 244
Brown, V. K. (*quoted*), 264
Burt, Cyril, 268

C

- CCC (*see Civilian Conservation Corps*)
Cabot, Richard, 259
California, 33, 52, 133, 218, 225, 263, 273, 309, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 324, 326, 353, 356
Camp Fire Girls, 100
Canada, 51, 343
Carr, Lowell Juilliard (*paper*), 289
Case stories, 28, 53, 109, 144, 148, 161, 170, 173, 175, 177, 183, 194, 197, 201, 219, 220, 221, 223, 225, 281
Case work (*see also Juvenile court and Probation*), 53, 130
rural, 167 ff
Census Bureau (*see U. S. Bureau of the Census*)
Central States Probation and Parole Conference, 335, 355, 383
Chappel, Richard A., 371
paper, 204
Child Welfare Services (*see U. S. Children's Bureau*)
Children's Bureau (*see U. S. Children's Bureau*)

- Chute, Charles L., 351, 352, 355,
356, 357, 358, 371, 372, 375, 378,
379, 381, 382, 383
papers, 43, 349
- Citizens' Committee on Control of
Crime (*see New York*)
- Civilian Conservation Corps, 199,
201, 356
- Clinics, psychiatric, 48, 127 ff, 138
- Close, O. H. (*paper*), 133
- Colorado, 353
- Commonwealth Review, 68, 80
- Community councils (*see Coordinating councils*)
- Community organization (*see also Coordinating councils*), 26, 296 ff
national committee on, 323
national conference on, 306, 324,
355
- Compacts, interstate, 328, 335
- Connecticut, 18, 87
- Conzelmann, Fred J., 136, 137, 138
- Cooley, Edwin, 45
- Coordinating councils (*see also Community organization*), 308 ff
Berkeley, 285
national advisory committee on,
323
national conference on, 306, 324,
355
Rochester, 310
- Cosulich, Gilbert, 360, 362, 378
paper, 327
- Crawley, Edward J., 379, 382
- Crime (*see also Delinquency*)
control, 1 ff
prevention, 289 ff
recreation as prevention, 265,
266
- Cummings, Homer S. (*see also U. S. Attorney General*), 207

D

- Decisions, legal (*see also Legislation*)

- Frad v. Kelly, 333
- Delinquency (*see also Crime*)
causes of, 193
nature of, 244
prevention of, 265, 273 ff
- Detention, juvenile, 209, 210
- Devil's Island, 11
- Dickens, Charles (*quoted*), 26
- Dickson, Virgil, 284
- District of Columbia, 317, 318,
319, 322, 328, 333, 350, 353, 356
- Doyle, John J., 371, 382
- Durkheim, Emile, 240

E

- East, Allan (*paper*), 127
- Edson, Robert C., 382, 383
paper, 160
- England, prison sentences in, 23

F

- Fagan, Bernard, 45
- Federal Bureau of Investigation,
12, 47, 259
- Federal courts (*see U. S. District Courts*)
- Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act,
207, 327, 332
- Federal Prison Bureau (*see U. S. Bureau of Prisons*)
- Finley, John H. (*quoted*), 258
- Florida, 16, 17, 350

G

- Gee, Howard L., 371
- Georgia, 18, 327, 328, 356
- Girl Scouts, 100
- Glueck, Bernard, 241
- Glueck, Sheldon, 361, 375
quoted, 249
Sheldon and Eleanor T., 15
- Grant, Glen O. (*paper*), 256
- Grant, Pryor McNeill, 37, 41
- Group work, 240 ff

H

- Hagerty, Frank W., 356, 357, 358, 359, 363
 Harper, William J., 360, 361, 369, 381
 quoted, 90
 Harrison, Leonard V., 37, 41
 Hartwell, Samuel W. (*paper*), 109
 Healy, William, 247
 Hiller, Francis H., 354, 355, 378
 Hoffman, L. Wallace, 369, 371, 382, 383
 Holmes, Justice Oliver Wendell, 27
 Hoover, J. Edgar, 260, 261
 quoted, 259
 Howard League for Penal Reform, 23
 Hunter, Joel D., 45

I

- Illinois, 180, 309, 318, 319, 320, 321, 350
 Indiana, 52, 309, 318
 Institutional treatment (*see Schools, correctional*)
 Interstate Commission on Crime, 335, 336, 361, 369
 Interstate compacts (*see Compacts, interstate*)
 Iowa, 322

J

- Juvenile court (*see also Case work and Probation*), 55 ff, 205
 Canada, 343 ff
 Juvenile Court Judges' Association (*see National Association of Juvenile Court Judges*)

K

- Keegan, Monsignor Robert F., 362
 Kehrl, Herman, 80

- Kelly, John C., 371, 382
 Kentucky, 321, 327, 329

L

- Lawes, Lewis E. (*quoted*), 260
 Leavenworth Prison, 22
 Legal decisions (*see Decisions, legal*)
 Legislation (*see also Decisions, legal*), 327 ff
 Lehman, Herbert H. (*quoted*), 20
 Lies, Eugene T., 262
 Lindholm, Arthur C., 336, 361, 362, 371, 374, 382
 Lipshutz, Daniel M., 135
 Lombroso, 240
 Long, Donald E., 211, 382, 384
 Lossing, Elisabeth (*paper*), 273
 Louisiana, 327

M

- MacGill, Helen Gregory (*paper*), 343
 Maine, 350
 Maller, J. B., 24
 Marijuana, 22, 195
 Maryland, 33, 40
 Massachusetts, 16, 17, 18, 43, 44, 45, 48, 52, 93, 240, 248, 309, 317, 327, 330
 McCord, Vera H. (*paper*), 167
 Mead, Bennet, 214, 215
 Merrill, Lilburn, 45
 Michigan, 52, 289 ff, 317, 350, 356
 Ann Arbor Boys' Guidance Project, 290
 Child Guidance Institute, 291
 Delinquency Prevention Council, 294
 Minnesota, 18, 309
 Mississippi, 327, 330
 Missouri, 160, 163, 309, 319, 351, 353

Moley, Raymond, 49
 Montana, 309
 Morris, A. Newbold, 362
 Mulready, Edwin, 45
 Murphy, Joseph P., 45, 361, 369,
 371, 374, 379, 382
 papers, 93, 335
 Murphy, L. F., 360, 361, 369, 382

N

NYA (*see National Youth Admin-
 istration*)
 National Advisory Committee (*see
 Coordinating councils*)
 National Association of Juvenile
 Court Judges, 335
 National Committee on Commu-
 nity Coordination (*see Commu-
 nity organization*)
 National conference on community
 organization (*see Community
 organization*)
 National Conference of Social
 Work, 1, 70, 75, 355, 380, 383
 National Probation Association,
 72, 92, 95, 104, 105, 153, 164,
 241, 308, 323, 324, 325, 327,
 328, 336, 337, 349 ff, 379, 383
 addresses, 358
 advisory committee, 373
 annual meeting, 369
 resolutions, 370
 by-laws, 385
 committees, 336, 361, 382, 383
 conferences, 355, 382
 cooperation with PIRA, 353
 coordinating council project, 354
 field service, 349
 institutes, 358
 legal research, 360
 membership, 363
 officers and board, 349, 362, 369,
 371, 373, 379, 380, 381
 professional council, 349, 360,
 369, 379, 382

 program, 389
 publications, 358, 383
 publicity, 360
 report, 349
 staff, 378
 treasurer's report, 366
 western office, 353, 362, 378
 National Recreation Association,
 256, 257
 Congress, 264
 National Social Work Council, 323
 National Youth Administration,
 199, 280, 349
 Nevada, 309
 New England Conference, 355
 New Hampshire, 351
 New Jersey, 8, 16, 17, 18, 93, 296,
 309, 331, 335, 356
 New York, 7, 8, 16, 17, 18, 20, 43,
 44, 45, 52, 309, 310, 317, 318,
 319, 320, 321, 327, 331, 351,
 353
 Citizens' Committee on Control
 of Crime, 21
 North Carolina, 18, 321

O

Ohio, 317, 322, 332, 352, 353
 Oklahoma, 16, 17, 352
 Olson, Willard C., 290
 Oregon, 66, 127, 130, 211, 318, 352
 Orr, H. P., 294

P

PIRA (*see Prison Industries Re-
 organization Administration*)
 Parole, 3, 9, 10, 12 ff, 20, 26, 35, 41,
 42, 163, 164
 New York State Board of, 20,
 21
 U. S. Board of, 209
 Parsons, Herbert C., 45
 Parsons, Philip A. (*paper*), 66

Passage, Victor C., 371
 paper, 87
 Pennsylvania, 320, 321, 357
 Pfeiffer, Timothy N., 373, 375
 Plant, James S. (*quoted*), 242
 Police, 273 ff
 Poling, Daniel A. (*quoted*), 264
 Preston School of Industry, 133
 Prison Industries Reorganization
 Administration, 8, 33, 353
 Prisons, 15, 47, 48
 occupations in, 7
 purpose of, 4, 6
 Probation, 9, 25, 35, 41, 42, 83
 case work, 140 ff, 155
 federal, 51, 206, 208, 333
 history, 43 ff
 personnel, 51
 rural, 140 ff, 150 ff
 state supervision of, 50, 52
 statewide, 150 ff, 160 ff
 training for, 66 ff, 87 ff, 93 ff
 Professional Council (*see National Probation Association*)
 Psychiatry, 109 ff
 in correctional schools, 133 ff
 Public Administration Service, 81

R

Rainey, Homer B., 258
 Rhode Island, 18, 44, 48, 50, 309, 352
 Robinson, B. H., 382
 paper, 150
 Rockefeller Foundation, 76, 79
 Roosevelt, Franklin D. (*quoted*), 165, 205

S

Sacco-Vanzetti, 4
 Sargent, Albert J., 45
 Schermerhorn, C. M. (*paper*), 225
 Schools, correctional, 15
 cooperation with, 133 ff
 treatment in, 133 ff

Scudder, Kenyon J. (*quoted*), 265
 Sex offender, 20
 Slaughter, E. M. (*quoted*), 269
 Slavson, S. R., 245
 Smyth, George W., 361, 369, 373, 375
 paper, 53
 South Carolina, 332, 357
 Soviet prison colonies, 5

T

Tennessee, 18, 352
 Texas, 318, 352, 357
 Thompson, Charles B., 242
 quoted, 252
 Towne, Arthur W., 45
 Training (*see Probation*)
 Training schools (*see Schools, correctional*)
 Treatment, institutional (*see Schools, correctional*)

U

U. S. Attorney General, 5, 207, 208, 209
 Conference on Crime, 323, 333
 U. S. Board of Parole, 209
 U. S. Bureau of the Census, 16
 U. S. Bureau of Prisons, 7, 8, 12
 U. S. Children's Bureau, 15, 206, 207
 Child Welfare Services, 163, 167
 U. S. District Courts, 204
 Ulman, Joseph N., 371, 375
 paper, 27
 Uniform Crime Reports, 16, 17, 19
 Utah, 39, 44, 50, 150, 151, 319, 320, 353

V

Vaughan, Charles B., 382
 Vermont, 44, 48, 50, 352

Virginia, 16, 17, 317, 319, 328,
332, 358
Vollmer, August, 273
Volz, Edward P., 45

W

WPA (*see Works Progress Administration*)
Wales, Ralph G., 353, 362, 371,
378, 384
Wann, Harry A., 263
paper, 296
Washington, 140, 141, 149, 167,
309, 317, 318, 320, 322, 353, 358
Western Parole and Probation
Conference, 356

West Virginia, 358
Wickersham Commission, 15
Wilkes, Mabel E. (*paper*), 140
Williams, Frankwood E., 245
Wisconsin, 16, 17, 44, 309
Wollan, Kenneth I. (*paper*), 240
Works Progress Administration,
147, 179, 199, 284, 287, 310
Wyoming, 50

Y

Young, Kimball, 245
Young Men's Christian Association,
198, 230, 299
Young Women's Christian Association,
278, 280

